

the public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12796) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remodel and repair the present post-office and subtreasury building and the appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 12797) to amend an amendment to an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 12798) granting a pension to A. W. Dumm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12799) granting an increase of pension to Carl F. Gatterdam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12800) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius D. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12801) granting an increase of pension to Donald A. Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12802) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12803) for the relief of John Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12804) granting a pension to Charles Cranmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 12805) to authorize the commissioning of Dr. Hugh Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12806) for the relief of Peter Swartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12807) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12808) granting a pension to Catherine Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12809) granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 12810) granting an increase of pension to William Middagh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12811) granting a pension to Huston Frey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12812) granting a pension to Holman B. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12813) granting a pension to Samuel Walls; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12814) granting a pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 12815) granting a pension to Jane Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1904. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the city council of the city of Portland, Oreg., indorsing the action of the American Association of State Highway Officials, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1905. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of the Wallace S. Chute Post, No. 76, of the American Legion, opposed to the proposed bonus for the soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1906. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of 16 citizens of California, protesting against the sale by the United States Shipping Board of former German ships seized by the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1907. Also, petition of the members of the Wesley Methodist Episcopal Church of Richmond, Calif., favoring independence for Armenia, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1908. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Rockford and Streator, Ill., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1909. Also, petition of the Boone Post of the American Legion, of Belvidere, Ill., relative to compensation for the widows and orphans of the late war, also the disabled and their dependents, etc.; to the Committee on Way and Means.

1910. Also, petition of the local union of the International Hod Carriers and Building and Common Laborers' Union of America against the Sterling-Graham bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1911. Also, petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of America, favoring an increase in salary for the personnel of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1912. By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Petition of G. L. Edwards and 27 others, of Cumberland, Iowa, against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1913. By Mr. HERSMAN: Petition of City Council of San Jose, Calif., protesting against the sale of the former German merchant fleet; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1914. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Amory, Browne & Co.; Parsons Trading Co.; P. Pastene & Co.; J. H. Williams & Co.; W. E. Aughinbaugh, foreign and export editor New York Commercial; Nafta Co.; Pfister & Vogel Leather Co.; McElwain, Morse & Rogers, all of New York City, favoring the continuation of the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1915. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce relative to certain provisions in the present appropriation bill, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1916. Also, petition of McElwain, Morse & Rogers Co., of New York City, favoring maintenance of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1917. Also, petition of the Ship Construction & Trading Co. (Inc.), of New York, relative to certain legislation that will be introduced; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1918. Also, petition of the Nafta Co., of New York City, in support of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, etc.; also, the Samstag & Hilder Co., supporting the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1919. Also, petition of the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to the Mexican situation, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1920. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of the George A. Morris Post, No. 306, the American Legion, of Paulding, Ohio, favoring House bill 4464; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1921. Also, petitions of the Warren L. McIntire Post, No. 262, the American Legion, of Hamler; the Herbert E. Anderson Post, No. 117, the American Legion, of Defiance; and the Ottawa Post, No. 63, of Ottawa, all in the State of Ohio, relative to all ex-service men and women entitled to bonus of \$50 bond, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1920.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 27, 1920.)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Harding	McKellar	Sherman
Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Simmons
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	Owen	Trammell
Elkins	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phelan	Warren
France	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	King	Poin Dexter	Williams
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	
Gerry	Knox	Ransdell	
Gronna	Lenroot	Reed	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained from the Senate by the death of a member of his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained on account of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

As in legislative session,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3037) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment to the Department of Agriculture, Post Office Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service, and certain other surplus property to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KAHN, Mr. MCKENZIE, and Mr. DENT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3076) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COLT. I have a short telegram from the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Woonsocket, R. I., which I should like to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

WOONSOCKET, R. I., February 27.

Hon. L. B. COLT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Copy of resolution adopted by board of directors February 25:

Whereas the progress and the safety of the world demand it; and Whereas in order that the vital interests of the United States and its nationals in Europe may be fully protected and the attention of our Government and our people may be concentrated upon our domestic problems it is essential that the peace treaty be ratified immediately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Woonsocket hereby urge the President and the Senate to take prompt action with respect to the treaty of peace with Germany, with such reservations as will fully safeguard every fundamental principle of the Government of the United States. Letter follows.

WOONSOCKET CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mr. NELSON. I have here a short resolution from the American Legion at St. Cloud, Minn., protesting against the \$50 a month bonus. I ask that it may be read. It is very short. It is such a wholesome resolution under present conditions that I think it ought to be noted.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

"Whereas the executive committee of the American Legion, believing that the rank and file of the organization was favorable to a bonus and has therefore suggested that a bond of \$50 be given to each service man and woman for each month of service; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States already is burdened with excessive war debts, causing great public unrest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wallace S. Chute Post, No. 76, of the American Legion, express itself as opposed to the American Legion being put in the position of asking for such bonus, thereby imposing a great burden on the rest of the people of this country at this time; and be it

Resolved further, That we are opposed to the matter of a bonus or adjusted compensation being brought up this year, thus making the ex-service men and women the tools of selfishly ambitious politicians; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to our national headquarters, to our State headquarters, and to our Minnesota member of the national executive committee."

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution from the American Legion Post at St. Cloud, Minn., protesting against the \$50 a month bonus be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Aero Club of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a department of aeronautics, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pomona, Great Bend, Emporia, Park, Tonganoxie, Ford, Montezuma, Buffalo, and Humboldt, all in the State of Kansas, and of College View, Nebr.; Rich Hill, Mo.; and Tacoma, Ohio, remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 331, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, of Atchison, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Sterling-Graham sedition bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Southwestern Millers' League at Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for extensions of credit to encourage foreign trade, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. McLEAN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3958) to amend section 14 of the Federal reserve act, and I submit a report (No. 457) thereon.

I wish to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to consider this bill next Monday, and I hope that every Senator who is interested in the measure will avail himself of the opportunity to read the report of the committee, which contains the reasons assigned by the Federal Reserve Board for this legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ANNIVERSARY OF LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

Mr. HARDING. As chairman of the joint special committee appointed under the provisions of House concurrent resolution 14 to confer with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any political subdivision thereof and with officers of any organization or societies or with individuals relative to the contemplated observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, I submit a report accompanied by a joint resolution providing for the appropriation recommended, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Library.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Library.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3990) placing Lieut. Col. Charles C. Teare, of the Judge Advocate General's Department, upon the retired list and to retire him with the rank and pay of a lieutenant colonel upon the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 3991) for the relief of Fred E. Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3992) authorizing the exchange of certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3993) for the relief of the heirs at law of Jacques Clamorgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3994) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3995) providing for the relinquishment of certain described property by the United States to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT—CONFEREES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is necessarily detained from the Chamber on account of illness. He is one of the conferees on the water-power bill and has asked to be relieved from service upon the conference.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that he may be relieved from further service on the committee of conference, and that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] be appointed in his place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama will be relieved and the appointment of the Senator from Florida will be made accordingly.

MAGNA CHARTA.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on Monday, I believe, I obtained consent of the Senate to have the Magna Charta printed as a public document. I omitted at the time to ask that my remarks in making the request be printed with the document. I now make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

CLAIM OF GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY (H. DOC. NO. 654).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and on motion of Mr. LODGE was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State and accompanying papers in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States based on the action of the authorities of Hudson County, N. J., in holding for their appearance as witnesses in a criminal case in that county, in violation of treaty provisions between the United States and Norway, as the Norwegian Government alleges, three members of the crew of a Norwegian ship called the *Ingrid*, and I recommend that, as an act of grace, and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of State.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
28 February, 1920.

DISTRICT PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the suggestion and under the authority of the Vice President, the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] as the select committee provided for in Senate resolution 310 to investigate the public-school system of the District of Columbia.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] for a moment while I make some suggestions about his substitute for reservation No. 4.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not reverse its action and adopt this proposed reservation. It not only is opposed to the action of the Senate for four months, but after the treaty has gone into effect as to other nations it is a proposition to amend it as between those nations and make it absolutely impossible for ratification or for the other nations to accept it and admit this country on the terms of the Senator's reservation.

Mr. President, the principal object of adopting reservations instead of amendments, which I voted against from the beginning, was that the reservations should apply to this country alone and might be accepted by the other powers without disturbing the relations between those countries. After that battle has been fought and that principle has been settled the Senator from Nebraska now offers a reservation which amends the treaty not only as to ourselves but as to every party to the treaty.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If it would not interrupt the Senator—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator if the process of accepting an amendment, now that the other signatories are operating under the ratified treaty, so far as they are concerned, does not require the unanimous vote of every Government which has membership on the council and a majority vote of all the other members of the league in order to get the treaty amended?

Mr. KELLOGG. It undoubtedly does, except as to this country, which is not a party.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But I mean if we adopt this alleged reservation, an actual amendment, which, as far as we are con-

cerned, it is, you could not accept it by mere diplomatic notes. It would have to be an amendment of the treaty under the terms of article 26 of the covenant.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator is quite right, and I will come to that point later.

Mr. BORAH. In this connection may I ask a question? By what process did they accept the reservation or amendment which Switzerland put on the other day with reference to reserving her historic policy of neutrality? I read in the press dispatches that the amendment of Switzerland had been accepted by the council of the league.

Mr. KELLOGG. Undoubtedly. I will state to the Senator from Idaho that if it applied to Switzerland alone, as the Senator from Connecticut said, of course they would accept it, but if it applied not only to Switzerland but to all the other countries which had already become parties to the League of Nations and the treaty it could only be amended as provided for by the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; but did the council of the league undertake to assume an acceptance even for the purpose of binding Switzerland?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not know as to that. Undoubtedly it did not have authority, because the other countries would be the ones to determine it.

Mr. BORAH. It occurred to me that it did not have any authority, but it was a fine illustration of what it is going to do without authority.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I may say, if the Senator will permit me, that the press reports stated that the supreme council of the league had accepted it.

Mr. KELLOGG. The reservation proposed by the Senator from Nebraska provides:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council or assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers in international law to be a domestic question.

Therefore, as I said, it would be necessary to amend this league and this treaty as between all the other nations parties to it, and the only possible effect it could have would be absolutely to prevent ratification and destroy the treaty so far as this country is concerned.

I have believed for a long time that it was the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to defeat this treaty, to defeat it with Republican votes if he could, and with Democratic votes if he could not accomplish it any other way.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that the Senator from Nebraska is not making very much headway in furnishing votes for the business.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I congratulate both Senators upon their new alliance, and while I can not wish them success I wish them all the pleasure they can get out of the alliance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If there is any alliance it is at least in the open; it is not in a secret, nonpartisan, bipartisan compromise, tentative committee.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that so far as the irreconcilables are concerned, if we may call them that, or the "bitter enders," or whatever we may call them, they have made no secret of the fact that they intended to defeat the treaty in any event, if possible; but I will further say that even the Senator from Connecticut rather hesitated to undertake to defeat the treaty now by putting an amendment on it which he knew would mean its certain death.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am in favor of direct action, honestly in the open, Mr. President.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think so. Now, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did not understand. Was a question addressed to me?

Mr. KELLOGG. I was simply congratulating the Senator upon his new alliance; that is all.

Now, Mr. President, as to subdivision 4, if I may have order in the Chamber—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has created a disturbance; we are hunting for new allies.

Mr. KELLOGG. I can not even hear what the Senator says, there are so many Senators who wish to speak.

Mr. BORAH. I said the Senator had created a disturbance; we are hunting for new allies.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator will please wait until I get through before he hunts any more allies.

Now, Mr. President, so far as reservation No. 4 is concerned, if the treaty is to be ratified—and I hope it will be—it is going to be with reservation No. 4, which protects this country as to all its internal policies, its political policies, and domestic questions.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is not the Senator from Minnesota an irreconcilable?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I will let the Senate judge what I am when I get through.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to state an ultimatum.

Mr. KELLOGG. Why, everybody knows that there is not a member of the council or a party to this treaty who would intentionally submit their domestic questions to the decision of any tribunal. So far as I am concerned I have no objection to striking out the word "commerce," but I do not see that it really makes any difference. The council and the league would not have any control and could not decide in arbitration any question as to foreign commerce unless that commerce came under some treaty or rule of international law now existing or existing when the question arose.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator just made a statement—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield for a question, but not for a speech. I want to make a speech myself.

Mr. REED. I wish the Senator would tell us why what he has just stated is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. Because as to whether we shall trade with Argentina, Germany, Australia, or any other country is a question between the particular country and this country, and the league has no jurisdiction over it. If we have a treaty whereby we are granted equal privileges and we are denied them, or we grant equal privileges and then refuse them, that would be a question arising under a treaty and could therefore go to the League of Nations.

Mr. President, for those who are earnestly in favor of the ratification of the treaty the entanglement over the Adriatic question is a rather discouraging feature. I am not going to discuss the merits of the dispute about the boundary between Italy and Austria-Hungary and Serbia. My position is that it is none of our business; that this country ought not to try to settle the boundaries of all of the aspiring nations, new or old, in Europe, which have emerged from the war with some degree of autonomy. I do not think it is our place to do so, and I do not believe the President is justified in attempting to dictate the adjustment between Italy and her neighbors.

Why, Mr. President, it certainly more intimately interests the countries of Europe than it does us; undoubtedly that is true; but the idea that because we took part in the war we are now going to try to dictate the settlement of disputed boundaries and meddle in all the quarrels which follow such a great war as this is unthinkable. If we are going to do this before we have any treaty at all, what will we get into if we do not have an adequate reservation to article 10 after the treaty is signed? I say, therefore, that the Fiume or Adriatic incident does not afford a very encouraging outlook for the smooth operation of the treaty.

Mr. President, I do not know on the face of it why Italy should not protect herself as to her frontier. Austria-Hungary is the ancient enemy of Italy. For generations, yes, for centuries, Italy has lived under the shadow of Austrian and German domination. She went into the war and made great sacrifices. Austria has been defeated, we may say dismembered and humbled, but she may rise again. Why should not Italy protect herself by acquiring the territory inhabited principally on the north by Italians and also protect herself by taking the territory around the head of the Adriatic Sea? Austria's control of that territory has been a menace to the peace of Italy.

I am not going to discuss the Serbs or any other race that inhabits this particular territory, for since the days of the Roman occupation, Roman, Venetian, Italian civilization has had its foothold upon the eastern shores of the Adriatic, and a Roman emperor was born there.

But, Mr. President, let us for a moment consider the ground on which the President undertook to dictate the boundaries between Austria-Hungary and Jugo-Slavia and Italy.

Let me read what the President said in his note of February 24, 1920, to the prime minister of Great Britain and the prime

minister of France. I invite the earnest attention of the Senate to the statement. Mr. Polk, speaking for the President and in the name of the President, said:

He—

The President—

believes it to be the central principle fought for in the war that no Government or group of Governments has the right to dispose of the territory or to determine the political allegiance of any free people. The five great powers, though the Government of the United States constitutes one of them, have in his conviction no more right than had the Austrian Government to dispose of the free Yugoslavic peoples without the free consent and cooperation of those peoples. The President's position is that the powers associated against Germany gave final and irrefutable proof of their sincerity in the war by writing into the treaty of Versailles article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations, which constitutes an assurance that all the great powers have done what they have compelled Germany to do—have foregone all territorial aggression and all interference with the free political self-determination of the peoples of the world. With this principle lived up to, permanent peace is secured and the supreme object of the recent conflict has been achieved. Justice and self-determination have been substituted for aggression and political dictation.

Mr. President, let us consider for just a moment how far self-determination, which has been applied to prevent the protection and the aspirations of Italy, played a part in the settlement at the peace conference at Versailles. The declaration of self-determination seems to be the central point on which all the other considerations rest in the determination of the Italian question.

What part did self-determination play in the settlement of the Saar Valley question? It played no more part than it did at Versailles in 1871, when Germany demanded and forcibly took from France Alsace and Lorraine. Nobody pretended that self-determination determined the taking from Germany of the Saar Valley. I am not disputing the justice of that action; it was the result of war; it was just retribution, we may say; in fact, I know of no reason why France should not have taken the territory to the Rhine, if it was necessary to protect her. Germany did not hesitate to take French territory in 1871. But to say that the high and altruistic principle of self-determination ruled in the settlement of the Saar Valley question is to say that which is an absurdity.

What part did self-determination play in the Shantung matter? Was China consulted? Were the people consulted whose territory and rights were handed over to Japan? Not at all. What part did self-determination play in the establishment of the modern Serbia? Everyone knows that Bosnia and Herzegovina are simply remaining as a part of the Serbian Government while the shadow of Austrian indemnity is hanging over them, and no longer. What part did it play in the case of Montenegro? Everybody knows that that hardy people, living in their mountain fastnesses, independent for many years, are to-day seething with revolution and rebellion against the control of their country by Serbia. Self-determination had nothing to do with erecting this new nation, which I believe, or fear, is held together by a rope of sand.

I may pause to ask, Are we to pledge ourselves for all time to furnish our manhood, our money, and our resources to maintain those nations which have been erected without regard to the principle of self-determination? I am not saying that they should not have been established, but I am saying that they were parceled out and were not built upon the principle of the self-determination of their people.

Mr. Lloyd-George naïvely asked the President how much did self-determination have to do with the 3,000,000 Russians who were taken into Poland and the 3,000,000 Germans into Czechoslovakia?

Mr. President, I am not inveighing against the establishment of Poland or of a modern Serbia or the other nations which have come out of the storm and the crucible of war. I am saying that self-determination has not been the rule and was not the rule in many cases in the settlements at the Versailles conference. That peace conference, which I believe did honest work as far, perhaps, as it was possible, was actuated by the same motives, the same ambitions, the same hopes and aspirations which have actuated great conferences following other conflicts in history. To say that they were actuated only by the highest motives, and established nations only on the high principles of self-determination and liberty, is to say that which is not true, and I have no doubt it was impossible. You can not surround the peace conference with any such sanctity, nor can self-determination be made the real basis for the settlement of the disputed line between Italy and Austria.

Why, Mr. President, it was the ordinary peace conference. True, this country did not ask anything. We were the most disinterested, and therefore occupied the highest and the most powerful position; and I think we should have said to those nations: "Fix your own boundaries and settle your own dis-

putes. We have helped to vanquish Germany, and we are now willing to withdraw, to act with you in bringing about peace in every way we can, but will not attempt to dictate all of the boundaries and the disputed questions of Europe."

Mr. President, I sometimes think it is a pity that we have not the genius of a Shakespeare to-day to throw around this peace conference the golden halo of romance and lift it from its sordid base. I do not know that they were to blame; but when we attempt to justify all the things that were done as having been along lines of high altruistic motives it can not be done. The members of the conference were human, as we are.

On these grounds I am not opposed to the treaty—not at all. I am not opposed to the League of Nations—not at all. I am in favor of it. I am in favor of taking them both and making the best of them and using our influence to help pull Europe out of the slough of despondency and ruin where the war has placed her, but I do not favor the United States becoming the dictator of Europe. I believe it is therefore all the more important that in the ratification of this treaty—which I hope and believe will be ratified—we should adopt reservations to protect this country in the exercise of all its powers of government and in the settlement and adjustment of all its domestic questions.

I earnestly hope that the reservation offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] will be defeated and that the one adopted by the Senate at the last session of Congress will be again adopted and that upon that principle this treaty will be ratified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gronna	Kirby	Poinexter
Beckham	Hale	Knox	Pomerene
Borah	Harding	Lenroot	Ransdell
Brandeggee	Harris	Lodge	Reed
Capper	Harrison	McKellar	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Henderson	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Elkins	Kendrick	Owen	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Keyes	Phelan	Watson
Gerry	King	Pittman	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], in making his attack upon the reservation which we have presented as a substitute, has gone far afield to argue matters that have nothing whatever to do with this reservation, and I refer to them only for the purpose of stating very obvious answers to the criticisms which he makes upon the President.

I assume that he is criticizing the President and the representatives of other countries because they turned the Saar Valley over to France for 15 years.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Did not the Senator hear me say that I did not criticize the transaction?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator spoke in such a voice that I lost a part of what he said; but if he was commending the act, then, of course, what I say does not apply. The Saar Valley was turned over to France for 15 years for the stated necessity of giving to France reparation for the damage that Germany had done in destroying the coal mines in the Lens region of France. If Germany had not turned over to France the Saar Valley, with its coal mines, for 15 years it would have been necessary for Germany to make payment in cash or some other means; and it was as much for Germany's benefit as for the benefit of France that the coal mines of the Saar Valley were placed at French disposal for that period of time.

When the Senator intimates that the principle of self-determination was violated in turning over the Saar Valley to France he forgets that at the end of that time a plebiscite is to be taken, and the people of the Saar Valley themselves are to be permitted to decide whether they shall come under the Government of Germany or the Government of France. Thus, instead of the policy and principle of self-determination having been

violated, it was distinctively vindicated in the Saar Valley matter, and it was done very largely through the influence of the President of the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator means, of course, the people who may happen to be in the Saar Valley 15 years from now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course; I mean just that thing, and I so stated.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I can not entirely agree with either Senator. I think the Saar Valley was turned over to France by way of compensation for the coal fields that had been destroyed in France. It was to give France an opportunity to use that coal in place of the coal that had been destroyed in the coal fields of France.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That was exactly my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. KELLOGG. And in answer to that I said in my speech that I entirely approved of it. I should not have objected if they had given the entire Saar Valley to France for all time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; but the Senator was instancing that as a case in which the policy of self-determination was violated, and I am stating to the Senator that that presents a case in which the principle of self-determination was vindicated, because the people of the Saar Valley—a valley which for centuries has been a source of quarrel and dispute between Germany and France—are to be given the first opportunity in their history to decide to which country they shall belong; so that instead of being a source of criticism of the President for abandoning his principle of self-determination, it vindicates that principle.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us what the racial population of the Saar Valley is?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I am not able to state that offhand. It is a mixed population. Probably at the present time it is more German than French.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us whether France has held it since the Napoleonic days?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I think not. I think it is probably as far back as that time.

Mr. REED. Can the Senator tell us how long it was held at that time by France?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, I do not remember that; and I do not care, because it is immaterial to my discussion.

Mr. REED. I only ask because the Senator stated that for centuries the valley had been a source of dispute between the two countries.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have stated that the reason for turning over the Saar Valley to France was one of reparation. France was in a desperate condition for need of coal, and the reason she was in a desperate condition for need of coal was that Germany had very largely destroyed her coal mines in northern France.

It was a matter almost of necessity to recompense France in this way, but the French claim to the Saar Valley, so far as it was a permanent claim, was denied, and it was limited to 15 years; and at the end of that time the people of the Saar Valley were given the right to decide for themselves to which allegiance they should adhere.

The Senator again questions the statement that the principle of self-determination was violated when the nation of Poland was reconstituted, because within the boundaries of that nation so reconstituted there are said to be about 3,000,000 Russians. That presents one of those difficult questions which the council in Paris had to deal with. Everyone knows that when you come to the border lines of those countries races and nationalities intermix, and it is not possible to draw a geographical line which shall be absolutely accurate from ethnological standards. You are bound to include some of two and sometimes of three nationalities within the same area. But Poland was once a nation, and when Russia and Austria and Germany divided Poland among themselves it was a natural thing that Germany as well as Russia should induce and encourage their people to come into what was purely Polish territory.

The same is true of Czechoslovakia, the reconstituted nation of Bohemia. There, also, will be found to-day an element of Germans, but that constitutes no reason why the old nation of Bohemia, which for so many years has been held in subjection,

should not be allowed a resumption of the government of her own people, even when there may be a certain per cent of the foreign element within her borders.

The questions of geography and ethnology were difficult questions for the council to decide, and it comes with poor grace, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], from Senators on the other side of the aisle, who did all they could to destroy the influence of the President of the United States when he was laboring in Paris to maintain the principles of his 14 points, when they sought to destroy his influence in Paris, to charge that he did not entirely succeed in all his altruistic efforts and all his devotion to the ideals which are embodied in the doctrine of the 14 points.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What did you do to uphold the hands of the President in those days? What did you do to strengthen his arms? You stood here in the Senate of the United States and by speeches and by votes did all you could to discredit him and to let the people of Europe believe that he did not represent the public sentiment of the United States; and now you assume to come here and twit him with not having succeeded in all that he undertook to do.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator state anything that I did to hamper the President in Paris? Apparently he scorned any assistance from anybody.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will state some things the Senator did. The Senator joined in a conspiracy on that side of the aisle to stuff the Committee on Foreign Relations full of enemies of the treaty, Senators who were pledged to vote to defeat the treaty when it came here.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is one thing the Senator did. The Senator supported that plan, and that was the initiative, it was the beginning, of the effort made here in the Senate to destroy the treaty.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, the Senator knows that that is not true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator from Minnesota has done other things. While always assuming to be a friend of the treaty he has joined his colleagues over there in preventing every effort at compromise. He knows just as well as we know that you have succeeded in producing a solidarity of support for these reservations, a solidarity of support for yielding to the enemies of the treaty on that side of the aisle. How have you succeeded in getting a majority of the Senate to support these reservations? Have you done it by getting the votes of friends of the treaty? I ask the Senator from Minnesota, if he will give me his attention, whether it would have been possible to secure a majority of the Senate for the pending reservations without the votes of the 14 enemies of the treaty and the League of Nations? Will the Senator answer me that question?

Mr. KELLOGG. I do not think it would have been possible to get any reservations to protect this country without the entire Republican vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator knows that when he agreed to those reservations under the assertion that he was a friend of the treaty, he voted for the very reservations that the enemies of the treaty supported because they thought it would kill the treaty.

Mr. KNOX. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. Two or three times lately the argument has been made that has just been made by the Senator from Nebraska, that Senators on this side failed to uphold the hands of the President while he was in Paris molding this treaty, and not only failed to uphold his hands but attacked him in the measures which he was trying to put through. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska, with the wires centered in the hands of Mr. Creel and the censorship that could not be overcome, what information did we ever get as to what was to be put into the treaty or what was put into the treaty until the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] procured a copy of it through a newspaper and had it put into the Record here?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There never has been a time in the history of the world when the Senate has been advised in advance what the representatives of the President were doing in their negotiations. The Senator knows very well that the power to negotiate treaties is an Executive power, and I assert that the President had a right as the Executive to go there and make his treaty with the executives of the other nations.

Mr. KNOX. I am not challenging that at all, Mr. President. I recall very distinctly that before the President went upon this mission he took this case outside of the ordinary case and told us that all he would know we should know, and we sat here in expectation for months hoping that we could get some knowledge; but we got none. I am not saying that the President was not within his rights by secretly negotiating the treaty, because as the negotiator he could select any method that he saw fit; but I do not want this side of the Chamber to lie under the unjust accusation that we were attacking the measure which he was trying to put through when we had absolutely no information about it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not said that you were attacking the measure. What I said was that you were attacking the President and endeavoring to discredit him in every way and weaken him in the efforts he was making there in Paris; and when now you find here and there a flaw, as you see it, in the treaty, comparing it with his ideals, you are taking advantage of your own wrong. After having done all you could to weaken him, you are trying to point out that he did not succeed in some of the things he aimed to do. That is what I am asserting.

But, Mr. President, this is not very germane to what is now before the Senate. The question before the Senate is the reservation which I have presented, and which I presented last November, known as reservation No. 4. It has been criticized by the statement that it involves an amendment of the treaty, an amendment of the League of Nations. Mr. President, that comes certainly with poor grace from Senators who have been voting for amendments, from Senators who have been supporting reservations, which do change the treaty in vital and essential particulars. It is rather remarkable that they, after a record of that sort, in which they have sought to tear the treaty to pieces and amend the League of Nations and nullify the provisions of the League of Nations, should now charge that I am engaged in that enterprise.

Mr. President, this reservation, which had the support of Senators on this side of the aisle last November and which I hope will have their support now, is an interpretative reservation, and it is such a reservation as we think proper to attach to the treaty. It covers substantially—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Who does the Senator speak of when he says "we"? This proposition has never been approved, so far as I know, by any Democratic conference or Democratic steering committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know that the Senator was present, but early in November a Democratic conference was called and these reservations were read to them, and they agreed to stand by them and they did stand by them, including the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to correct the Senator. I did not stand by them. A motion to direct the Committee of the Whole to report the treaty with certain reservations does not mean that you stand by the reservations, for at the time I cast my vote I called attention to the fact that no one would be bound by the report, but it would come to the Senate with the right to amend the report, and that is entirely true. Voting to bring it again to the Senate from the Committee of the Whole did not mean an indorsement of this reservation, or, rather, this amendment to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am rather surprised that the Senator from Georgia should make that statement. He made that explanation a few days ago, and I called his personal attention to the fact that he not only voted for my motion at that time, including this reservation among others, but that on a previous occasion he voted for this reservation itself as a separate proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not recall that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be glad to enlighten the Senator. On November 15 last I presented in the Senate the following reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers to be in international law a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matters relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

That is almost identically the same reservation. The only change I made at this time was in striking out the words "international law," which, I think, was an accidental inclusion and which does not change the meaning of the reservation in any respect. On the roll call the yeas were 43 and the nays were 52, and among the Democrats who voted for that reservation I find recorded "SMITH of Georgia."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the language was different; but even were the language the same, the effect will be different. The Senator can laugh, but he is now fighting the

treaty. The language was different and the effect will be entirely different. At that stage of the procedure on the treaty last November it might have been practical to adopt an amendment to the treaty, but at this stage, when we know that no amendment can be put to the treaty, after so many countries have acted, we know it will defeat the treaty, and I think the course of the Senator can only be accounted for upon the ground that he is ready to defeat ratification of the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is welcome to his own conclusion. I think probably the Senate and the country will be able to decide whether I have been for the treaty or against it. There are some Senators you are hardly able to identify as to whether they are for it or against it, but I believe it will be generally agreed that I am for it.

But, Mr. President, this is not an amendment of the treaty. It is an amendment offered to the reservation of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], because it is a substitute. I desire at this time to read my reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or assembly, for decision, report, or recommendation, any matter which it considers to be a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

Is there any Senator here who claims that a nation is required to submit to the league, its council or assembly, for decision a matter which is a domestic question?

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator wish to have me answer?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Under the League of Nations the question whether a matter is a domestic question or not may be decided by the league, and therefore the league may have jurisdiction over domestic questions. This says "that no member nation is required to submit," and so forth. That would include England, France, Italy, and Japan, who have already ratified the treaty, and would release them absolutely from the obligation of that provision of the League of Nations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Any intelligent man knows that the League of Nations is formed for the purpose of dealing with international and not with domestic questions, and any intelligent man knows that no member of the league, the United States or any other, will ever submit to have its domestic questions passed upon by the league.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I never have thought that any reservation on this subject was necessary. I never thought that the league, formed to deal with international questions, would ever attempt to assert its control over domestic questions. The only reason why I ever introduced it, and when I introduced it last November, was in the hope that it might secure the votes of some Senators on the other side of the aisle who have become obsessed with the idea that their reservations are more important than the league itself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Do you mean by this amendment that the council of the league shall still determine what are and what are not domestic questions? Do you mean by this provision—I will not call it an amendment—to take away from the council of the league the right to determine what are and what are not domestic questions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean that no nation is required, just as the language says, to submit to the league or any of its organs the power to pass upon a domestic question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand, but the league covenant provides that the council shall determine in case of a dispute whether it is or is not a domestic question. Article 15 provides that "if the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report." Does the Senator intend by his substitute to change that provision in the league covenant and take away from the council the right to determine what are and what are not domestic questions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the council may report that, but no nation is required to submit to it. That was not necessary. It was put in there because Senators of the United States, when the first draft of the league came over here, stated that there ought to be a reservation on the subject. They stated that it might be interpreted to mean that the league might take jurisdiction over domestic questions, and so this additional paragraph which the Senator has just read was inserted, but it is not exclusive.

That still exists; that is not changed. The council can still do so, but no nation is required to submit to it, and never was required to submit to it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me ask the Senator, Does not the league covenant expressly provide that we will submit all disputes to the council and that the council shall continue to handle them, unless the point is made that a dispute is a domestic question, and then does it not provide that the council will still handle the question, though we claimed that it was a domestic question, unless the council found that it was domestic? So has not the Senator left in the council the privilege of determining what are and what are not domestic questions, or else has he not changed the covenant by his provision?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the claim that this reservation changes the covenant is no stronger than to say that the reservation presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] changes the covenant. The only difference between the two reservations is that the reservation presented by the Senator from Massachusetts asserts a right of the United States, while my reservation asserts that same right but declares it is a right which belongs to all members. If we assert the right as to ourselves the provisions of the covenant are just as much affected as if we said that other nations shall be upon the same basis.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, I want to ask the Senator, does he change, by the proposition which he has offered, the paragraph of article 15 which declares that the council shall exercise control of all controversies unless the council finds that they involve domestic questions? Does the Senator mean that the United States shall determine whether or not a question is domestic, or does he mean that the council is still to determine, under the league, whether a dispute is domestic? Which does the Senator mean?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the first place, this does not put everything under the control of the council in the broad manner the language of the Senator implies; and, in the second place, I assert that my provision makes less of a change in the league than the reservation presented by the committee, and for this reason: The fundamental principle of the League of Nations is that all members of the league are upon an equal basis; that one is bound just as another is bound. It is provided in the committee reservation that the United States shall be placed in a class by itself; and I judge from what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Kellogg] has said that he avers that we shall be placed in a class by ourselves, that we shall not be bound, but that the other nations shall be bound to submit to a certain thing. That is a violation of the fundamental principle of the League of Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Whereas my reservation provides that the right which we claim for ourselves is a right which belongs independently to every other member of the league. The relative positions of the nations are in no wise affected by my reservation, whereas the reservation which Senators on the other side of the aisle are supporting makes a distinct and emphatic difference between the United States and other nations, and that is out of harmony with every principle of the league.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only want to ask the Senator one more question, and then I will quit. Will he tell us whether he means by his substitute to take away from the council the right to determine whether or not a question is domestic or international? Does he mean that we shall determine that for ourselves, or that it shall be left to the council?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean to say that no nation—the United States nor any other nation—shall be compelled to submit to the council a domestic question nor to permit the council to decide what is a domestic question.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the Senator if a dispute comes before the council, and the council determines that it is an international question and not a domestic question, does the council have jurisdiction of the dispute?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Under this reservation—

Mr. LENROOT. I mean under the treaty as it stands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Under the treaty as it stands the council has power to act, but I have no doubt that the nations need not recognize the act.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Then what becomes of the agreement that where the council has power to act and acts unanimously the nation does bind itself to stand by the award?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator, I am sure, in his fair moments will not claim that the nine members constituting the council are going to establish a principle which will enable the council at some time to go into their domestic affairs. It was never intended that the league should mix in domestic affairs, and I do not think even the Senator from Wisconsin will say that the council would ever undertake to usurp functions that were not properly intended it should exercise.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but supposing one of the parties to the dispute makes the claim that it is not domestic but international, who is to decide the dispute under the treaty as it stands?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it would not be a dispute.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The nation would have the right to say: "That is a domestic question, and not for the consideration of the league."

Mr. LENROOT. But one party to the dispute claims it is not a domestic question. Who then decides?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Nobody. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Then what was the purpose of the treaty in providing that, if the council finds that the question is a domestic one, it shall not take jurisdiction?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It provides that it shall not take jurisdiction in that event; it does not provide that it shall.

Mr. LENROOT. It says that in that kind of a case it shall not make a report; and the Senator from Nebraska, although he may not be a lawyer, well knows that where they are denied the power to make a report in a given case, it implies the power to make it where that condition does not exist; and then we have bound ourselves to abide by the decision.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I disagree with the Senator entirely. It is simply a limitation on the powers of the council, and the reservation which is presented from the Republican side of the Senate proposes an additional limitation that makes it apply only to the United States. Now, I say it is a violation of the very principle of the league to give something to the United States which we are not willing to accord to all members of the league. My reservation is framed on the line of interpreting the treaty to mean, as I believe it does mean, that no nation shall ever be required to submit its domestic questions to the decision of the league.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what, in his mind, is the difference between a reservation and an amendment? I am sure it will be interesting to the Senate to know.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I observe the Senator from Wisconsin and a number of other Senators on the other side of the Chamber are very anxious to probe into the workings of my mind on these questions; but I have stated before that I am not disposed to split hairs with them on these subjects. There has been entirely too much of hairsplitting since we began the consideration of this great document; there has been too little disposition to accept its principles and to accept its objects and entirely too much disposition to split hairs on the fine meaning of words, on the theory that we were entering into a contract with a lot of bandits and were likely to lose our rights.

Now, what are the facts, Mr. President? The facts are that in common with the other democracies of the world we are undertaking to enter into an agreement to preserve the peace of the world. We ought to enter as equals, one being bound no more than the other is bound. We are not dealing with the murderous and criminal element of the world; we are dealing with the great democracies of the world that are governed by public opinion; and those democracies have an interest, as we have, in agreeing to do those things which will work for peace and agreeing not to do those things which will produce war; and yet we have spent nearly a year here in considering reservations on the theory that we were dealing with a lot of criminals and cutthroats and confidence men. Can not we, the greatest Nation in the world, enter into a compact with the remainder of the world to preserve its peace without haggling over reservations supposed to be in the interest of protecting our rights?

What reservation has been offered on the other side of the aisle designed to strengthen the league, designed to improve its efficiency, designed to preserve the peace of the world, designed to reduce the armaments of the world, designed to do justice to the subject peoples of the world? Those which have been offered are all petty, hairsplitting reservations, written on the theory that we are an innocent lamb about to go into a menagerie of wild animals and that we have to protect ourselves.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska thinks it is very unfair for some of us to ask him to disclose what is in his mind on these important subjects; but I wish to ask the Senator, when he asserts that our reservations are amendments, is it not fair and is it not due to the Senate that he explain what in his mind is the difference between a reservation and an amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. An amendment is something which destroys the very purpose and spirit of the league, and such an amendment is found in the reservation to article 10. I will give the Senator an illustration.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator does that, if he will yield further, I rather thought that was the Senator's idea of what an amendment was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that is my idea.

Mr. LENROOT. But nobody else agrees with the Senator from Nebraska as to that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, I deny that conclusion of the Senator; but it is immaterial whether they do or not; the fact is that as to article 10, which is an agreement that all members of the league shall respect the territorial integrity and political independence of all other nations, members of the league, and preserve them against outside aggression, you write a direct repudiation of that obligation into a reservation; you repudiate in the strongest language any obligation to do that thing, and you call it a reservation.

Mr. LENROOT. How can we repudiate something until we have assumed it? The reservation referred to merely declines to assume the obligation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is an amendment; that is what I say; that is what I am claiming, that the Senator is endeavoring to change the league, and he is not only endeavoring to amend the league in one of its most important covenants, but he proposes to have the United States stand out by itself and say to the remainder of the world, "You are bound to preserve as well as respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members of the league, but we are not bound; you are bound to do that thing, but we are not; you assume the burden, but we do not." That is the position of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what rights, duties, or obligations of any other member of the league are affected by these reservations, and what rights, duties, and obligations are affected by his substitute? Then we will get the difference.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have just stated to the Senator that the President of the United States went over there and negotiated a treaty that led to the formulation of a covenant for a great league of all the democracies of the world, designed to preserve peace. The nations were to come in as equals; they were to be equally obligated to do certain things, one no more than another. He brings it over here and the Senator from Wisconsin, while sometime described as a "mild reservationist," becomes the strongest advocate, perhaps, of a reservation which absolutely repudiates and refuses to accept an obligation which the other nations of the world not only agreed to accept but which they have ratified. He takes the position that we should now enter the league relieved from the obligation which the nations that fought the war with us, and which with us are obligated to maintain the peace of the world, have assumed. I say such a reservation is misnamed; it is an amendment; that is the reason that the Senator from Idaho and his colleagues, as they frankly avow, support these reservations; that is the reason the Senator from Connecticut supports these reservations; they go to kill the league, and that is what those Senators want to do. They are frank; they are fair; they are candid; but those Senators who, like the Senator from Wisconsin, support these destructive reservations on the theory that the league will still live, are either very much misguided or something worse.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not the Senator's difficulty that he assumes that the President of the United States in negotiating this treaty bound the United States? Of course, he did no such thing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; that is not my difficulty. The President exercised a constitutional authority. You can reject the league; you can reject the treaty, if you have the votes to do

so, but when, under the pretense of making a reservation, you destroy our participation in it, you have done a contemptible thing; you have entered a league in which we are to have the benefits but only a part of the burdens.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly tell us what benefits we are to get out of this league? I should like to have a bill of particulars right now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In the first place I know of no country more interested in preserving the peace of the world than the United States; I know of no country where the sentiment against militarism is stronger than in the United States. If the league covenant goes into effect, the peace of the world is going to be preserved. The United States is enormously interested in Europe—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will ask the Senator not to interrupt me until I finish my answer. The United States sells most of its surplus products to Europe. Aside from any sentimental reason, Europe when facing destruction, Europe whose civilization has been actually in danger by this war, is a field in which we have deep interest. If we in the United States look over to Europe in times of prosperity and peace, we look upon the part of the world that is our greatest customer. Europe buys our surplus farm products, Europe buys the products of our mines, and Europe has begun to purchase in a large degree the products also of our factories. Now, if civilization is to go to wreck in Europe and by constant wars Europe sinks, as it may, to the state of Asia, we lose our greatest customer. So, aside from any altruistic reasons, aside from any ideals, the United States is interested not only in restoring peace to Europe for material reasons, but in keeping the peace in Europe.

Again, in this war, in which the United States has accumulated a debt of \$26,000,000,000, she has incurred also the enmity of a large part of the people of Europe, and, if no device of civilization is formed to preserve the peace in the future, the United States must necessarily prepare to defend herself some day from the people whose enmity we have incurred—not only Europe but Japan.

There seems to have been a perfect madness on the part of Senators in this Chamber to offend and antagonize every nation in the world. Japan has been denounced in the most bitter and extreme terms, and Japan has been given to understand that the people of the United States view her with enmity. We have heard speeches here in this Chamber in denunciation of Great Britain and in criticism of France and in denunciation of all the peoples of the world, even those that have been associated with us. So I say, Mr. President, that if we are not ready to go into the league to help the world to maintain peace, we must prepare for war.

When the Senator from Missouri asks me what benefit we get out of it, I ask him, What benefit would we have had out of it if the league could have been established 10 years ago, before this war began? We would have escaped the expenditure of thousands of millions of dollars and the loss of fifty or sixty thousand men dead upon the fields of France and Flanders. The United States has much to gain by an arrangement of this kind.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, since the Senator asks me—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not asking the Senator anything. We have much to gain by entering into an agreement to maintain the peace of the world. The United States is the greatest nation in the world—the greatest in commerce, the greatest in wealth, the greatest in credit-giving power, the greatest in population—and the United States is interested in the peace of the world; and when the Senator asks me what benefit we have to derive from it, I say there are many benefits—much more than ideals—that we can derive if we can devise a plan to maintain the peace of the world.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator says that we are interested in the peace of the world. We are; but he then asserts that this League of Nations will give us that peace. There is the bone of contention. He assumes that it will; we assume that it will not; and when his assertion that it will give us peace is taken out of his syllogism there is nothing left.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yielded for a question. I hope the Senator will not make a speech in my time.

Mr. REED. The Senator did not say that he yielded merely for a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator can take his own time to reply. I want to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. REED. Just let me say this, and I shall be very brief about it:

The Senator's main argument—and I just want to get that clear—is that we have incurred the enmity of all of Europe through this war, and that if we do not have the League of Nations all of Europe will come over here and conquer us.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. REED. I think that was a fair construction of what the Senator said. If he did not mean that, then I think he will have to revise his remarks. Does the Senator think that, if we enter into a combination with our enemies, that will make them our friends—that we will be safe with men inside the house who are ready to attack us from the outside?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have not said what the Senator attributes to me. I have said that the time has come in the world's history when it is governed by democracies; that if by forming the league at this time we can maintain the results of the war, the world will remain in the hands of democracies; and these democracies, governed by public opinion, are entirely capable of making a contract with each other not to do the things that work for war and to do the things that work for peace.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? He says the world is governed by democracies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I said so.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think that Japan is a democracy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is rapidly becoming a democracy.

Mr. REED. Oh, I may be rapidly becoming an angel, but I have not yet arrived at that stage.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I know whereof I speak when I say that Japan is rapidly becoming a democracy. The change that has come over the world represents the passage of the world from one stage to another. We are entering into a new era, just as much as the world entered into a new era when the Dark Ages passed away.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is just simply a question whether the United States is going to do its part in reorganizing the world for peace as it has always been organized for war. Heretofore the world has been organized for war. Every nation has used probably more than one-half of the revenues of its government for destructive purposes; and possibly there was no way to put an end to that condition until the fall of the German Empire and the Russian autocracy and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, all of which were bent on conquest; but that time has passed away. Great Britain is a democracy. Her Government responds more immediately to public opinion than the Government of the United States. Her cabinets rise and fall as the public opinion of Great Britain changes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I decline to yield.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. France has become a republic, and her government is in the hands of her people. Italy is a limited monarchy, ruled by a cabinet, not by a king, and that cabinet comes and goes in accordance with the public opinion of the people of Italy. The same is true of Spain. The same is true of Holland. The same is true of Belgium. The same is true of the Scandinavian countries to the north, and it is going to be true of Russia. Russia is going through the welter and the strife of a revolution, just as France did, and Russia will emerge into a republic, just as France emerged.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there? If Russia is emerging into a republic, will the Senator tell us why the fathers of the League of Nations sent their armies in on that republic?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I trust the Senator will not insist on interrupting me when I have asked him not to do so.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have been good-natured in yielding to questions.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. NEW. Is it required of the members of the cabinet in these foreign nations that they shall have minds that track with that of the monarch?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I regret that the Senator from Indiana is not disposed to take seriously what I say. I am trying to make an argument to the effect that the world is now controlled by democracies, and that those democracies are controlled by

public opinion; that Russia, which was an autocracy, is developing into a republic; that Germany has already become a republic; that in all those countries hereafter the power for war and for peace, instead of being in the control of a handful of men, is going to be in the control of the people; and that we can safely make a contract with those democracies, governed by those people, when we perhaps could not have safely made such a contract in the days when conquering empires ruled the world.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COLT. I understood the Senator to say that he thought it was dishonorable for the United States not to accept this covenant as it stands. This covenant comprises, I think, 26 articles. Is it not the duty of the Senate of the United States, as a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power, to examine into these articles, to see what they mean, and how far the interests of the United States are affected thereby? And if, upon examination and discussion, it should be found that one of those articles, in the opinion of the Senate, is detrimental to the United States, is there anything dishonorable in the United States saying that it refuses to be bound by that article, and that it excepts itself from that particular provision?

I should like to ask the Senator, further, if it is not the common practice, where a treaty embraces numerous articles, and where there are numerous contracting parties, for one of the parties to say that it will not be bound by a particular article or articles, and thereby make a conditional ratification, asking the other members if they choose to admit it into the contract upon the conditions which it imposes?

There can not be anything dishonorable, can there, for the Senate of the United States, in a treaty of this magnitude which was negotiated by the President, upon full review and consideration, to say that the United States ought not to be bound by some of the provisions of the treaty? Would the Senator's position be that we must practically take this covenant as it stands, and that we should not, under the circumstances, except ourselves from any of the articles? I do not take that view.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator has to some extent misunderstood me. I did not say it would be dishonorable for the United States to express dissent from a certain article. What I said was that it would be dishonorable for the United States, as the greatest and most powerful Nation of the world, to go into a league with other nations to do a certain thing, and then shirk our share of it. It is just the same as if the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut and I should sit down at a table and draw up articles of agreement under which we united to do a certain thing for the good of the community and for our mutual good, and then, when the three—the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut—had signed the agreement, if I should lean back and say, "Well, I am going to sign this on a little different basis. I am going to provide that I will not agree to do that which you have already agreed to do. I am going to release myself." I say that in a case of that kind I would be doing a dishonorable thing. I say that I would be a shirker in the great work of redeeming the world. I say that I would be putting upon the other nations of civilization the burden of maintaining the peace of the world, and running away from my duty myself. That is what I call dishonorable.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, the Senator is using general phrases. When France excepted herself from certain articles in the slave-trade treaty it was not regarded as dishonorable on her part; and, of course, if she took herself out from certain articles she took herself out from the responsibility of those articles. I maintain that it is not dishonorable for the United States to take herself out from any article in this covenant if she thinks, under the circumstances, it is proper for her to do so, leaving the other nations the right to pursue the same course or not, as they please. The principle is what I am contending for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Carrying out the simile that I have used here, if I was not ready to assume an equal obligation with the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut I had better stay out of the league altogether and not get the benefits of it; and so I am in favor of the United States staying out of the league unless it is ready to go in as an equal and assume equal obligations with other members of the league.

Mr. COLT. That involves the proposition that the United States must take the league just as it stands. It involves the

proposition that where a treaty is made between numerous parties involving many articles it is dishonorable for any one of the parties to take itself out from a certain article, thereby relieving itself from the responsibility of that article. No such principle exists with regard to treaty making. No principle exists permitting the President to negotiate a treaty and then throw upon the Senate the burden of ratifying that treaty as it stands. The effect of such a practice would be to relieve the Senate of all responsibility as a coordinate branch of the treaty-making power.

I maintain that in this great treaty, which calls for a certain departure on the part of America from its traditional policy, the Senate has a bounden duty to examine every article, and if we reach the conclusion that the United States should not be bound by that article it is our duty to take ourselves out from that article; and such a procedure is not dishonorable. This is the common practice that is pursued in every treaty embracing numerous articles and having numerous signatories.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, like the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], I have gone far afield. The question before the Senate is this reservation:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly for decision, report, or recommendation any matter which it considers to be a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

That reservation is clear and specific and no man can claim that under it the United States is in any possible peril. The only difference between it and the reservation presented on the other side is that this reservation of mine leaves the United States an equal with the other nations. It claims no rights exclusively for the United States, but accords to the others the same rights which we claim for ourselves over our domestic matters.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] made an accurate statement in the closing part of his remarks when he stated that he had traveled far afield and discussed a good many questions which were not strictly relevant to his amendment. But the Senator has not seemed to me from the beginning either to have had a clear conception of the difference between an amendment and a reservation, or if he has, he has not been able to convey his idea of the distinction between them to me. I prefer to think that he has not a clear conception of the fundamental difference between the two things, because I do not charge him with any lack of sincerity or any incapacity in the use of the English language.

The Senator in a somewhat inconsistent way charges us with having voted for some amendments to the treaty, and then, congratulating himself upon his present attitude, he offers an amendment to it himself. I voted for every amendment that the Committee on Foreign Relations recommended to this body, but the majority of the Senate at that time, led by the valiant and chivalric Senator from Nebraska, slaughtered them on the ground that they would defeat the treaty, that it would necessitate resubmission to the peace conference and reconvening the peace conference, although the peace conference sat there perfectly tranquil in Paris ready to receive and deal with anything that came before it at the time.

Now, however, it must be obvious to anybody, it seems to me, who wants to look at the question in its true aspect, that all the other signatory nations having ratified the treaty as it was written textually, having entered into the execution of the treaty and now operating under it in its original form, for us to offer a change in the text of the treaty making a change in the duties of all the parties who signed the contract, and are now in the performance of it, without their knowledge or consent, as well as a change in our own duties in respect to the treaty, of course it is, as the lawyers say, irrelevant and impertinent, not to say impossible and foolish.

This is the difference, if I am able to understand it, between an amendment and a reservation to the treaty. An amendment changes the text of the instrument as it was submitted to us. I suppose that statement is intelligible. Changing the text means striking some words out of it or inserting some additional words into it, or both. No reservation that the Senate has adopted to the treaty does any such thing. We realize that we can not change the text of the treaty now because as to other parties it is all accepted and in operation, and they have plainly said so. They have ratified it and approved it as it stands. We do not approve it as it stands and by reservations we say that the United States in ratifying the treaty understands that it shall not be bound to do certain things, or that it understands that the treaty in using certain words shall, so far as we are concerned, be construed to mean such and such a thing. That is, any reservation which we adopt, we adopt in our own proper right and authority, as we have a perfect right, and there are

innumerable precedents for so doing. We are not meddling with the affairs of the other nations. We are defining our own duties if we ratify this thing and if the other powers are willing to receive our instrument of ratification without protest. We are saying: "We are willing to form this limited partnership with you if you want to have it on that basis. It is entirely optional and voluntary with you. If you do not like our construction of certain parts of the treaty, if you do not like the reservations of understandings that we have adopted as defining our own responsibility, you need not have us for a partner. We do not attempt to influence you; we do not attempt to tell you what you ought to have said was your duty to each other, and which you have said by ratifying the treaty. That is none of our business; but it is our business, and our exclusive business, to say what contract we will make with you; and it is your exclusive business to say whether you want us to make that contract with you or not. We make open profert and tender before the whole world of our understanding of a paper negotiated by the constitutional authority of this country, the President, to negotiate a proposition and present it to his constitutional and equal partner, the Senate, for its approval." We tender that paper with our conditions affixed, made in accordance with the Constitution of the United States in the performance of our constitutional duty thereunder; and if the powers want to say to us, "That is perfectly satisfactory to us," how in the world does it lie in the mouth of either the Senator from Nebraska or any other American citizen to stand here in the American Senate and charge us with being dishonest?

So overwrought and to such high tension of blood pressure do some superheated temperaments become when they throw off all restraint, both physical and intellectual, in their ravings about this chimerical instrument of world power that I am not astounded at any charge that they make. Their sublimated imaginations have run along with, so to speak, the minds of Don Quixote and the faithful Sancho Panza so long that they think the new order of things, the special dispensation of which they have just enjoyed, is already in operation, and that certain of them have attained a new state of holiness and sanctification which utterly removes their immaculate presence from the contact of viler things, and that they have liberty to fulminate, belch fire, denounce, and hurl their anathemas upon the unregenerate even before they see this thing more or less through a glass darkly and without ultimate vision. Heretofore no restraint has been able to control their imaginings and vaporings.

But, Mr. President, the earth is still on its axis and inclined at the regular angle to the ecliptic and is spinning around the sun at the usual rate in spite of the covenant of the league, though I do not doubt that in its operation the covenant of the league will make certain unexpected changes in our daily lives if we become a party to it.

There is one thing that makes a doubting Thomas sometimes sit up and pinch himself and see if he is awake, and that is to see how the original embryo, and what might be called the model upon which the thing has been founded, is now "demonstrating" in actual operation. They have the league over there, and our allies and associates, Great Britain, France, and Italy, have a little difference of opinion with Jugo-Slavia about a little place called Fiume. The league, in its omniscience, is now fulminating. It is operating, not through its apprentices or its dummies or its hired men, whose minds run along with the people who appoint them, but it is operating through the master minds themselves. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning for three pages is filled with an account of the sweet harmony which is now existing between Mr. Lloyd-George and M. Millerand and the President as to the treachery with which they have dealt with each other in repudiating their most solemn agreements which they had jointly entered into.

Mind you, this is just in starting the sacred league that is to insure tranquillity and harmony and justice all over the universe. Before they have opened Pandora's box, right on the inside of the box, these gentlemen are accusing each other of bad faith and are using language that really hurts my feelings.

The President has frequently advised us—I will omit the preamble—that a "new day having dawned," no longer do these wicked nations view each other with suspicion, and so forth, but have all engaged in a mission of service to pure philanthropy, and are desirous of exhibiting their lofty ideals to each other when nobody is looking; that they are simply engaged in altruistic enterprises, not mentioning Egypt or Persia or Syria, or anything on the side that they got away with and openly "arrived at." The President, in rebuking these people who have not attained to the proper state of holiness and sanctity, says:

It is a time to speak with utmost frankness. The Adriatic issue as it now presents itself raises the fundamental question as to whether the American Government—

That is "him" [laughter]—

can on any terms cooperate with its European associates in the great work of maintaining the peace of the world by removing the primary causes of war.

My God! That is what they get first. They wheezed two or three times when they received that. Then the President went on, lest they should forget, and said:

The President—

I say the President went on. This is signed by a gentleman who spells his name L-a-n-s-i-n-g. He wrote the letter—

The President desires to say that if it does not appear feasible to secure acceptance of the just and generous concessions offered by the British, French, and American Governments to Italy in the joint memorandum of those powers of December 9, 1919, which the President has already clearly stated to be the maximum concession—

Not the obtaining of justice, but the maximum "concession"—that the Government of the United States can offer, the President desires to say that he must take under serious consideration the withdrawal of the treaty with Germany and the agreement between the United States and France of June 28, 1919, which are now before the Senate, and permitting the terms of the European settlement to be independently established and enforced by the associated Governments.

You notice the word "allied" has been dropped therefrom. Just think of that!

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. There is a suggestion there of the immediate withdrawal of the treaty, which of course can be done now. But assume that the Senate had approved the treaty and it had been delivered, he could not then get it out as it is now proposed, by stopping it. We would have to stay in for at least two years, would we not?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes.

Mr. REED. It is well enough to remark in passing that the Senate has left the President in a happy position where he can withdraw it up to the present time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We would only be eligible to withdraw, then, if we had performed all our duties under the covenant and all our international duties of every kind.

Mr. REED. To the satisfaction and approval and with the unanimous vote of all of the members of the league.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what it would be but for what the Senator from Nebraska is pleased to designate as our "destructive" reservation. These elements of destruction that offend the Senator from Nebraska are what the Senate considers to be necessary to protect this country and its constitutional institutions from utter destruction and this country from denationalization; and they are said to be "destructive."

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, there has been some discussion by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] with reference to the great benefits the United States would obtain under the treaty. Would the Senator from Connecticut consider those benefits to be of incalculable value if they were all to be thrown away on account of a few Italians on the Adriatic coast?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The President, of course, has stated from the beginning in his intense desire to have us ratify the covenants of the league and the treaty that the heart of the world would be broken if we did not do it; that Europe would lapse into chaos; that it was our plan duty and our Christian moral obligation to enter this thing; that we ought not to suspect anybody of ulterior motives, but that we ought to take the lead in the chivalrous mission to maintain the spiritual leadership of the universe, to jump right into this thing and take the league and hurrah for a new revelation, a human nature newly sanctified and rid of all its mundane attributes; and now at the very first intimation of a difference of opinion between him and the very gentlemen with whom he sat for six months in a dark closet in Paris, demonstrating the virtue of open diplomacy openly arrived at, he denounces them and says the league can go hang for all of him, that the heart of the world can break into its different valves and lobes and pulsate for themselves, because he can not have his way about some little thing that on the map of Europe would look about like the dot of a red pencil on it; the whole business is to be wrenched apart and he will withdraw the thing, and they can not only establish their own order but they can enforce it themselves at their own expense.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator referred to the place where the makers of the treaty sat as a dark closet, which I think describes it very accurately.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. En camera, I think the French is.

Mr. LODGE. I only call attention to the fact that Mr. Keynes, in his book, which most of us have read, the *Economic Consequences of the Peace*, speaks of finding them in a small and overheated room.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There was another one there into which they withdrew on proper occasions.

Mr. LODGE. It is highly probable.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator while cataloguing the evils which would result if we withdrew from the league, that the heart of the world is to be broken if we do not have our way about Fiume, that the civilization of Europe is to be wrecked, forgot to name the more important thing from my viewpoint, just mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. He told us that all the European countries are now at enmity with us and that they are likely to come over here to conquer us, and we might as well prepare for war if we do not adopt the covenant of the League of Nations. So it appears that we are about to plunge ourselves into a great and destructive war with all the world, according to the Senator from Nebraska, over the right of some Italians in a city on the Adriatic, a city which most of us never heard of until it came up in the treaty. I hope the Senator will not overlook that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; I do not overlook it. That is what we would be about to-day if we had put our foot into the trap. But we have not done so yet. If we do not put our foot into the trap, if we are liable to get into war with the rest of the world which wants to drag us in, at least I shall console myself with the consciousness that I am fighting under my own flag and for my own country and for something that I know something about!

I venture to say that the American people, for whom this Government is supposed to act, whether it represents them or not, are absolutely ignorant about the technical issues that are contained in the first four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-day, embracing the state papers interchanged between the President and the British and French premiers on the Fiume-Italian question. When the President tells them that it is the attitude of America that this, that, or the other shall be done, and that it is a fundamental and indisputable sine qua non of any participation of this Nation in the affairs of Europe that they should take his view of it, why, he is simply saying what he thinks personally.

There is no way of ascertaining what the views of America are on that question at all. Nobody here on the floor of the Senate, although we are pretty intimately associated, knows what the Senate itself would say if that question were submitted to it as an independent, unprejudiced tribunal to arbitrate the question. There is nobody who has the slightest idea what the United States Senate would say about that question or as to what was just and right. Here a voice issues from America, is heard in London and Paris and Rome, asserting all sorts of things with the greatest assurance, not to say cocksureness, as to what America thinks about this controversy. I have no doubt that, inasmuch as there are many millions of Italians and Jugo-Slavs in this country, America may be viewing this question with mixed emotions; at least, I think the ballot box would be somewhat mixed on it if anybody were running on the issue in one of our big metropolitan cities.

That is the sort of thing that is going on. I shall not quote at length from the State papers, but on page 3551 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1920, is the reply, signed Millerand, D. Lloyd-George, and Davis, to the President under date of London, February 17, 1920, which reads, in part, as follows:

The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, view with consternation the threat of the United States Government to withdraw from the comity of nations because it does not agree with the precise terms of the Adriatic settlement. The difficulty of reconciling ethnographic with other considerations is certainly not greater in the Adriatic case and does not produce more anomalous results than in the case of other parts of the general treaties of peace difficulties which were recognized by President Wilson and his colleagues where they agreed to the best settlement practicable at the time because their machinery for peaceful readjustment had come into being; also ethnologic reasons can not be the only ones to be taken into account is clearly shown by the inclusion of 3,000,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia and the proposals so actively supported by the United States delegation for the inclusion within Poland of great Ruthenian majorities, exceeding 3,500,000 in number, to Polish rule. Though the British representatives saw serious objections to this arrangement, the British Government have not thought themselves justified in reconsidering on that account their membership in the League of Nations. The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, earnestly trust that whatever the final view of the United States Government as to the Adriatic settlement may be, they will not wreck the whole machinery for dealing with international disputes by withdrawing from the treaties of 1919 because their view is not adopted in this particular case. That would be to destroy the hopes now entertained by countless millions of people all over the world that the most enduring and most beneficent part of the treaty of peace was the constitution of machinery whereby the defects of treaties could be remedied, and that changing conditions and requirements of mankind could be adjusted by processes of reason and justice instead of by the balancing of armaments and resort to war. The Governments of France and Great Britain can not believe that it is the

purpose of the American people to take a step so far-reaching and terrible in its effects on a ground which has the appearance of being so inadequate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know how the Senator from Connecticut views that statement on the part of the premiers of France and England wherein they seem to place so much confidence in this league. To my mind it is a very remarkable exhibition of insincerity upon the part of both of them. It is a matter of history that neither Lloyd-George nor Clemenceau nor Millerand have ever had any confidence in the league and over and over again have expressed themselves to that effect, privately and semipublicly. I simply call the Senator's attention to the manner in which propaganda is being constantly put out by those in Europe who want to accomplish certain purposes and undertake to accomplish them by eulogizing the league because they think the American people believe in it. The statesmen referred to do not believe in the league; they never have believed in it. They were unwilling to accept it as a guaranty of peace in Europe; they were unwilling to go into the league until certain prerequisite conditions were fulfilled which, to their mind, made it more safe for them. I do not, therefore, accept the statement of those gentlemen as being made with any degree of sincerity whatever.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think I take the same view of that subject as does the Senator from Idaho. I had not commented on the language which I read. The Senator took the proper occasion immediately upon its quotation to call attention to his view about it.

Of course, when these gentlemen say to Mr. Wilson that they can not believe that the American people will "wreck the whole machinery for dealing with international disputes," and so forth, they are using the lingo of Mr. Wilson to him; they are appealing to him in the well-known vernacular in which he appealed to them. It is the kind of talk that is prevalent upon this subject. Everything is going to wreck unless the league and the covenant go through.

Mr. THOMAS. It is diplomatic reciprocity.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is diplomatic reciprocity, or comity that exists between comrades, "hands across the sea." [Laughter.] They understand it all right; but this is a public document and it must keep up the superheated temperature of the crusade. It was a crusade, and the crusaders, having learned the international volapuk by which they communicate their spiritual emotions to each other, find it difficult to discard it now.

But, Mr. President, the world did get along for I do not know how many hundred thousand or millions of years without any league, and some of us thought we had arrived at quite a stage of civilization. At any rate, we have become advanced and intelligent enough in this country to establish a Government of constitutional guaranties; a Government by which the people, through their representatives, could carry out their will; a Government in which law and order and life and property were fairly well secured; a society in which every man, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, can act with equal force and effect at the ballot box; a Government in which whatever revolution existed consisted of simply "turning the rascals out" and putting the honest victors in their places until they in turn were subjected to a similar fate; but there was no blood letting or throat cutting about it. However, that evidently is no longer sufficient, and that Government of free men, which our fathers established in a bloody revolution against one of the very gentlemen with whom we are now interchanging this uplift talk, is now to merge itself, according to this league and covenant, in a super-government, and all these things that are embarrassing to any nation in the world are hereafter to be cared for by this super-government in the manner indicated by the judicial temperament which is manifested by these great world-powering statesmen, who have filled four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning with an interchange of drolleries.

There may be Americans who think "that is a consummation devoutly to be wished." As I have said from the beginning, this treaty and its constitution for a League of Nations—it was somewhat imprudently, although more correctly, named in its first edition as a "constitution for a new world order of things"—that constitution for a new world order, now called a covenant for a League of Nations, with what will be established in it and what it will acquire by its rotary movement in operation, like a snowball rolling down hill in a wet snow, with its permanent secretariat, now so beautifully filled by a British

duke, and all its minor positions occupied by foreigners, in continuous operation, with its hordes of paid emissaries, inspectors, and trouble makers of various kinds, will constitute a new and hitherto undreamed of political unit of power in the world; and that is what it is intended to do.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes.

Mr. REED. In that connection I should like to call the Senator's attention to the London Times of February 11, quoting Lord Curzon, as follows:

And I believe most profoundly that in the seriousness in which the council of the league approaches the problems before us, in the authority which it acquires—and everybody ought to lend a hand to magnify that authority—and in the spirit which characterizes its debates and its action will be the one real hope, not of Europe alone but of the world, that we are to advance into a new era.

I call attention particularly to the expression "and everybody ought to lend a hand to magnify that authority." So that already, before this league is formed, at least before we are a responsible party to it, the proposition is to "magnify its authority," and that coming from a responsible British statesman.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes, Mr. President; I thank the Senator. The more people dream about this covenant and this league and the functions which it is to exercise the more it ought to repel free American citizens who have been brought up upon the doctrine of home rule and minding their own business and avoiding entangling alliances and the more should it incline them to keep out of this thing.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Senator is discussing the official correspondence between our Government and the representatives of Great Britain and France, as printed in the Record, I should like to ask him his idea as to what the authority of these representatives is? In what capacity are they acting in the settlement of this particular dispute in Italy? As I understand, the League of Nations, under the treaty, has been actually put in force, but it is not the League of Nations that is functioning in this instance. Who gives to the representatives of Great Britain and France, and now the President in connection with them, the authority to settle this particular dispute? And if they settle this dispute between Jugo-Slavia and Italy without anybody selecting them, without having been selected by those Governments to settle it, why can they not be self-appointed arbitrators to settle any other dispute between any other nations? When are they going to cease and let the League of Nations, that has already been organized, get into operation and function?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, Mr. President, we get no information at all from the State Department or the White House about any of these matters, so that in answering the Senator's question I am left to my own guesses, so to speak, as to what is going on and why. I assume that the peace conference which framed the German treaty is *functus officio*; I do not know, but I assume so from the fact that the treaty has gone into operation among the European powers, and I suppose that the peace commissioners, so far as their duties in regard to the German treaty are concerned, are out of office, although I do not know, because I have no word of the President resigning to himself or disbanding any of his fellow commissioners, except his late Secretary of State. I assume that what is going on is that the various peace commissions of the different principal allied and associated powers, at the head of which in each instance except our own was the premier of the Nation, are still in operation upon the Austrian treaty, which involves the boundaries between Austria and Italy, and so forth, and also in relation to the Turkish treaty. As to the Bulgarian treaty, I do not remember, although it may be in the same category.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. How can that be true as far as the Austrian treaty is concerned, because that has already been signed and is in the possession of the President here, and a copy, although it did not come directly from the President, has been printed as a Senate document? But, even if that were possible, why is it that the representatives of only two nations assume to act? Why are not the other belligerents taken into consideration if that is one of the things to be settled in making a treaty, let us say, between Austria and Great Britain and France and Italy and Turkey and Bulgaria and Greece? Where are the representatives of the other belligerent nations?

The point I want to get at is, Why are these two representatives, one from France and one from Great Britain, assuming to settle this dispute, and where do they get their authority, and whom do they represent in such a settlement?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I can not answer by the card, as I stated before.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If I correctly understand the situation with regard to the Fiume dispute, France and Great Britain, each having a treaty made heretofore with Italy for the purpose of inducing Italy to enter the war, are trying to compose the conflict between the terms of that treaty and the requirements of the Jugo-Slavs, and they therefore have upon themselves, or have assumed the burden of making, if possible, some disposition of that *impasse* which the recognition of the Jugo-Slav nation has brought about. I do not vouch for that, but such is my understanding.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Connecticut will be kind enough to permit me, I am only asking for the purpose of getting information and elucidating the question; but if we assume that the Senator from Colorado is correct, still there must come a time before this can become a part of some treaty—and I do not see how it can be effective unless it does, so long as the League of Nations is not acting—there must eventually come a time when the nations themselves must at least give their approval.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly; and I presume that time will come, if it is possible to suggest something that will be acceptable to the two contending nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we must assume, I take it, that the settlement of these two nations, although only representing themselves, and joining now with the President of the United States—the President having objected because he was not in, so that will take Great Britain, France, and the United States in on it—we must assume that their settlement, whatever it may be, is going to be formally approved by the nations that are interested in the particular treaty of which this must be a part.

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly. No other nation would have the temerity to question the settlement which was agreed upon by the three principal parties to the treaty.

Mr. NORRIS. That is interesting to know. In other words, some other nation which technically, at least, had the same right to be heard, and whose signature was necessary for the approval of the treaty, would probably get into disrepute with these great powers if it presumed to have anything to say about what had been settled for it in advance and failed to put its name on the dotted line.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator's conclusion is a perfectly logical one.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, there can be no question that the weaker powers whose rights and properties are being dealt with by those who are negotiating this series of treaties will have to submit. They are helpless. When the principal allied and associated powers, who won this war and beat the great Triple Alliance which had been the terror of the world for nearly a quarter of a century—they had their armies and navies intact, greatly enhanced and increased in power. They had added thereto the entire German Navy and shipping, the disposition and operation of which could absolutely put an embargo and blockade upon the products of other nations and starve them to death, if necessary, to enforce the decrees of the great powers who are settling the disputes and determining the rights of these people who have a right to self-determination under one of the 14 points. What can Jugo-Slavia do if they are dissatisfied with the boundary between themselves and Italy or Austria? Why, immediately the league notifies its members that here is a matter concerning the peace of the world, and they make recommendations to the members of the league as to what shall be done about it. They will decide it. The treaty says they shall recommend, and they will recommend the quotas of ships and of troops and of money which the members of the league are to bring forward in the peaceful and benevolent promotion of the decision arrived at by the league in secret, star-chamber proceedings; and when our friends who are trying with honeyed words to toll us into this well-baited trap come to those articles of the covenant which, so far as they dare in cold type, set down that the star-chamber council is to apportion the quotas of death-dealing force to be furnished by each constituent member in promoting the reign of peace on earth and good will toward men—when the covenant itself sets that down, and the league is to decide how they are to be used to enforce its decisions, how much of self-determination by the poor and defenseless peoples of the world is there to be in actual practice?

If Jugo-Slavia does not accept the terms prescribed by these gentlemen who are writing state papers to each other, Jugo-Slavia had better look out; that is all there is to that. That is the way peace is to be established on earth, and to be maintained. But when article 10 is submitted to us for our approval in the name of the American people—for we represent the people, and not simply what these state papers call "the Government"; it sounds big and looks big when written with a capital "G," but it is written by one man—when we hesitate to say that we approve of the contract contained in article 10, by which we are to be made parties, and the principal parties, to an agreement by which we undertake to respect and preserve not only the territorial integrity but the political independence of every member of the league; when we hesitate and want to know what that means, and say that it is prudent for us to understand what obligation we, as the representatives of our respective States, are saddling upon the people of our States, before we do this, we are charged by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] with dishonor.

Mr. President, the dishonor would come if we adopted the other course. The dishonor would come to this country and to that flag if we agreed to article 10, assuming any such contract as that. Then, when the emergency arose, and the council called upon us for our quota of troops and our billions of treasure, if we, the Senate of the United States and the great House of Representatives, should enter into a debate as to whether we were morally bound or legally bound or actually bound to do what the council said, it would be claimed that we were dishonored if we did not "go along" with what would be declared to be the unanimous voice of civilization!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator speaks of the council calling upon the United States to furnish a certain quota. The Senator, of course, will admit that the council does not call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will use the word "recommend," if the Senator prefers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the council advises.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Well, what is the difference?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There never has been any question but that that is merely advice, which each Government is free to accept or reject. The Senator also admits that the council can not even give the advice unless it is unanimous, and that the United States in perpetuity has a member of that council, and the United States can control the action of the member of the council, so that the United States is in a position to prevent the council even giving the advice. How, then, can the Senator become so alarmed as to what advice the council may give?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am not particularly alarmed, because we are going to keep out of this thing, Mr. President; but it has taken nearly a year to inform the American people of what they were trying to stampede them into. If we were in it, I would be alarmed, and so would the people; and I will tell the Senator how it would operate.

The Senator brings up again the specious plea that we can not be hurt, because there must be unanimity in this "advice"—think of it!—the "advice" of a council that is to rule the world! You might call it "the friendly aid and succor," if you wanted to, or if you wanted to put a little more honeyed candy on the operation. He wants to know how we can be hurt by it if it has to be unanimous and we have a delegate there.

Well, this is the way it would be done:

The President would appoint Col. House, or Mr. Bainbridge Colby, or George Creel, or some of those people whose minds "run along" with his sufficiently, as our delegate on the council of the League of Nations, and he would be there because his mind "ran along" with the President's, and if it did not he would not be there very long. He would get what they call in diplomatic language his "exequatur," his ticket of leave. It would be an indefinite leave, too. He would be home on leave, but with about the same reputation as an ordinary "ticket-of-leave" man has. Suppose the dispute between Italy and Jugo-Slavia about Fiume comes up. Nothing could be done wrongly, the Senator claims, because it all has to be unanimous. Well, while Col. House, with every sensitive tentacle stretched to intercept the most delicate agitation of the ether waves by wireless, was sitting there quivering with the anticipation of hearing his master's voice, suddenly there would be two or three clicks of the instrument operated by Mr. Tumulty en camera in the White House, and Col. House would assume a virtuous attitude and say, "I cast my vote on this great question in the interest of the plain people. I make it unanimous."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have not finished with it yet. I have just started.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut further yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is aware that this side has expressed its entire willingness to have any delegate appointed either to the council or to the assembly confirmed by the Senate and his powers defined by the Congress of the United States. Under those circumstances, how can the Senator still claim that such a delegate would be under the exclusive control of the President?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, Mr. President, I do not claim that he would be under the President's dictation if Congress should say that he should not do anything without an act of Congress; but what sort of a league are you going to have if our participation in the spiritual leadership of the universe is to consist in having a puppet over there controlled by Congress, like a bear dancing around a hand organ with a chain around his neck?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator if that reservation has yet been adopted and made a part of our resolution of ratification?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, the Senator argued with us in the Foreign Relations Committee that it was one of the most abhorrent and destructive of all of the reservations that we had proposed; that it was a reflection upon the President and an attempt to hinder and minimize the participation of this great country in this great international body.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to me?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Why, certainly; and to the Senator's colleagues also.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the other hand, I have from the first taken the position that the powers of the delegate of the United States upon the council and in the assembly should be defined by Congress. I have at all times advocated the idea that such a representative should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and that his powers should be outlined by an act of Congress. The Senator must know that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator be willing to say that our delegate, sitting 3,000 miles away from us in conference with the other delegates, our fellow members of the league, should not cast a vote upon any subject without instructions from Congress?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not say that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well. Unless the Senator does say that he leaves the man loose to bind us.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have said that these powers could be defined, and ought to be defined, by Congress, and when it comes to voting on a question which involves possible war and the advising of nations to raise an army, he certainly should be under the control of an act of Congress. I hope the Senator will not again put me in the position of claiming that the delegate of the United States should be exclusively under the control of the President of the United States, because I have never believed it, I have never said it, and I have always advocated the idea that his powers should be defined by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator would not vote for a resolution of ratification which contained a reservation that this delegate might not cast a vote except by authority of an act of Congress, because it would render him impotent. Of course, we might say that he shall not vote to put this country into war, but nobody expects him to vote for any such thing, and I have not claimed that he would vote for such a thing. All I claim is that the advice which he would give, the advice in which he would join, would be advice which, if it were accepted, would put us into war many times; and when that advice has been arrived at, under direction of the President who appoints his delegate, and under the direction of other delegates appointed by the premiers or the heads of the various Governments, our fellow members of the league, and a decision has been made unanimous to advise a certain thing and they all agree to it, when the matter comes before Congress, the President having agreed to it in advance, the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with his party here in Congress either in control or in a minority and in either case solid behind him pressing for it, with the whole great emergency staring civilization in the face, I want to see the puny, pigmy-minded Congressman who would rise in his place here and defy the views of

civilization. Compared with the pressure that has been put upon this body for now over a year demanding that we should sign this paper without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" and merely mumbling a few interpretative reservations, which mean nothing at all, about our understandings, with nobody else saying they agree to them, the pressure that would then be put upon us to carry out that advice would be a thousandfold more than it has been at this session of Congress, and which has already been nearly enough, in view of the suppliant attitude of some Senators, to accomplish its purpose.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has shifted his position.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I will shift back again.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He now claims that the Congress of the United States would not have enough independence so to define the duties of the American representative in the council of the league or in the assembly of the league as to keep us out of war; but what the Senator said when I rose to interrupt him was that we were likely to be embroiled in a war against our will, because the council might call upon us to furnish soldiers.

I called the Senator's attention to the fact that the council does not make the call in the first place; that all it does is to advise; that we are free to accept or reject that advice, like any other nation; that that advice can not even be given until the representative of the United States concurs in it; and that that representative can be bound by act of Congress in advance, so that he can not do it without consulting the views of the United States. Can the Senator get away from that conclusion?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have gotten away from it twice, but the Senator comes right back to it. I will get away the third time.

The situation is this: If you bind your delegate effectually, so that he is responsive only to Congress and not to the President, you destroy the efficiency of the league, because it can not operate; it can not act in emergencies, where a rush is to be made by what the Senator is so fond of calling a predatory nation upon its neighbor. It is a council of nine and can meet and advise something quickly; but if the representative of the greatest and richest and most powerful nation member of the league, the pack horse of the league, who is expected to pay most of the expenses and do most of the work in its passion for service and altruism, can not say yes or no until a special session of Congress is called, if we are in vacation, and we organize and debate upon how much our moral obligation weighs at that time, it will not have a very serious deterrent effect upon the nation whose troops are then crossing the bridges of the international river which divides it from its victim.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There may be some force in what the Senator says, but he has been compelled to abandon the position which he took a few moments ago that the council could involve us in war without our consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; it would not involve us in war, because we would dishonor ourselves and not go into war. What I want to do is to get away from the "juggling fiends"—

That keep the word of promise to our ear
And break it to our hope!

I want either to assume the obligation or to refuse to assume it. The Senator wants to adopt article 10, by which foreign nations are going to be made to think that they can rely upon us as their ever-present help in time of trouble; just to sign it, guaranteeing the political independence and territorial integrity of every European and Asiatic member of the league, and when they call for help then we are to enter upon a casuistical debate upon the extent of our moral obligations, in parentheses, if any, to save civilization again. It is because, having had experience in the debate of being denounced as dishonorable people, we do not want to sign a dubious contract, as a result of which anybody can say in the future that we have made a scrap of paper of this. Is that fair to America or is it not? Our fellow members of the league are entitled to know what we are going to do if they make this international treaty with us.

Lord Grey, who is a great statesman and has had great experience in diplomacy, as we all know, came over here and waited for months for some purpose or other which was never fully revealed, to me at least, and then he sought his island home. Within a few days the Thunderer, Lord Northcliffe's vox populi, had a lengthy communication from Lord Grey, who is an observant gentleman and learned several things in this country even if he did not get into the White House. In that paper he said that he had been on the ground here, that he had talked with many Americans of all beliefs in relation to the treaty, and that he was there to say to them that if they proposed to have any dealings with this country the basis of their

dealings and the basis of the obligations that would be assumed by this country were contained in the reservations which the Senate had already adopted concerning the treaty.

He knew perfectly well what the reservation was on article 10. That reservation was that we declined to assume any obligation to protect anybody's territorial integrity or political independence. We do not ask anybody to protect ours. We do not ask this European or Asiatic league to protect the political independence of Uncle Sam nor to protect his territorial integrity. We do not protect our own territorial integrity along the Mexican border. Any bandit is free to kidnap an American citizen and string him up until he can find the resources of his friends and then name his price per head, and the Army and the Navy and the air fleet are daily ransomed in their uniforms from the agents of our great and good friend Carranza, the first chief.

But we have not called upon Europe to do it. We have called upon our own Government without success, but we never yet have demanded that Europe should do it. I believe Germany did come to our aid once and take off our distressed people from a Mexican city—I think it was Vera Cruz—when our own people would not do it. But we never yet have asked Europe to protect us.

Why do they want to drag us into protecting their political independence? Just think of it! Is it so that no government in Europe or Asia or South America is to be allowed to do anything that tends to overthrow the political independence of some other government in which we have only the most remote influence without our being summoned, under our guaranty and international undertaking, to maintain that existing status? Is it true that the people of this country actually, when you put it right up to a matter-of-fact, brass-tack vote, want the Senate to sign a contract so that if the people of Russia shall take it into their heads to march across the boundary of East India to aid an East Indian uprising against their British—what shall I call them—"benefactors" we have got to go in and put conscription back into force and summon from East, West, South, and North our military array and re-create the Shipping Board—which I hope by that time will have been abolished—to commence to build ships of mortar and steel and wood, and to have a new crusade for Liberty bonds and the Red Cross to raise money to go over and help Great Britain to keep East India, a member of the league, under the control of the British Empire? Is that what the royal American farmer wants? If he does not want it he had better keep shut of this thing, because we shall be lectured and bothered and badgered and denounced by the peoples with whom we are now on friendly relations if we do not come in to settle their troubles for them when they hoist the danger signal.

How does the unanimous requirement of the covenant protect us? You should remember this: Our delegate who sits on the council of the League of Nations engaging in these secret proceedings sits in an atmosphere to which he is not accustomed. It is a highly rarified and charged atmosphere. The delegate who sits upon the assembly to which cases can be removed from the council, and must be removed upon the mere request of any party in interest, is a gentleman who a year or two before the crisis arises left his country and has from that time lived in foreign parts. He is surrounded by the atmosphere of Europe. He reads the European newspapers. He talks several European languages or else he would not be capable of conversing with his colleagues. Every morning when he gets up he is confronted by the interests and the incidents that have happened in the capital where he is temporarily sojourning. His whole environment is that of Europe. He is under the control of the President of the United States, who appointed him. The President of the United States gets his information from his representative delegate over there.

Instead of selfishness and greed having been eliminated from human nature by the mere resolution of the Senate ratifying the treaty, human nature will go on just as it always has, and there will be just as much opportunity within the league and within the council and within the assembly for nations to look after their self-interest as there was without it, and unless selfishness has been abandoned and nations no longer look after themselves our delegate there—our one lone delegate—will be subject always to his local atmosphere and environment, to the entertainment and the numberless arts which are practiced so successfully by the diplomacy of the Old World upon our one American delegate.

He goes into the chamber alone. He is there with eight foreigners. As I said, all the President knows about what goes on behind those closed doors, in which there is an eight-to-one foreign majority, is what our delegate tells him. Our delegate and the President, having corresponded by wireless,

determine the attitude of America, and every man from Alaska to Florida and from Maine to the Hawaiian Islands under the jurisdiction of the American flag is bound by that action.

When our representative, under the instructions or the advice of the President, unless there is such a reservation or act to deprive him of his legitimate powers and render him an impotent figure, sitting there as an emblem of the impotency of this country, makes that verdict unanimous, it means something to us. You can not get away from that. There is no use to talk about it being a debating society or that it is only advice, which we can repudiate. It was upon a subject that was of sufficient international gravity to enlist the most careful thought of the ablest men of all the members of this great League of Nations, and our delegate certainly can not cast his vote except as directed by the President. If the President wants to make the vote unanimous and our man declines to do it, what becomes of him? He is not a free agent. The other men are. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is eternally right when he says that it is impossible for this country to enter into a combination providing for a council and an assembly, to be in continuous session in Europe, and appoint an accredited representative to take part in its proceedings and then to repudiate his decision.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's last statement is equally applicable to Part XIII. Once we appoint our representatives, we are in, are we not, and at least morally bound by the conclusion of the majority, or the two-thirds, which under some circumstances is made necessary in their proceedings?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; the Senator is entirely right. There is no getting away from it as a practical thing, and every American knows it. I have said repeatedly, and the more I say it the more I am convinced by my own repetition of the truth of it, that you can not half enter into an international alliance. The thing involves good faith or bad faith. It involves entire cooperation or else charges of betrayal.

There are some, and I have no quarrel with them—I am grateful to them for coming as far as they do, and I know they are acting in good faith—who believe that we have rendered America safe if we put on the reservations that the Senate has adopted. I agree with them that we have rendered the part we take in the operation of this great international machine for the enforcement of its will upon the rest of the world as safe as we can render it by the use of language; that we have protected ourselves by these reservations so far as mere words can do it. But, Mr. President, when this foreign assembly, utterly without any warrant from the people of America, have sat for a week or a month, being drawn from one position to another, and our delegate, being operated upon in various manners, drawn from one admission to another, finally take their view of it, what do our reservations amount to really?

It will have been demonstrated that they are mere paper reservations; that they can not control the practice of the thing; that they can not control the operation of it. We can say that our domestic questions shall not be under the jurisdiction of either the council or the assembly. Well, we can say it, but in the great interweaving of the commercial and other transactions of the world, the blending of interstate into foreign commerce, the mutual interplay of all the great financial and commercial relations of the nations of the world, these reservations and the things with which they deal will fade into "innocuous desuetude"; they will be worth nothing in practice. When our delegate wants to repel the overpowering strength of the eight foreigners who are forcing him into a corner to secure that one vote necessary to unanimity, when he hunts through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day or yesterday to pick out the little reservation which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has now pending before the Senate, in order to hold it up to these Europeans, I can see the look on their faces. They will simply laugh at it. "Why, yes," they will say, "that is what the recalcitrant Senate thought back in 1920, but the world has moved; it is now 1924, and you have been associated with us, going along with us, and our great international bankers have made all these interlocking, guaranteed poolings of the debts of the war, and their commissions are all based upon your voting to go along with us. My God! you are not going to desert us now; the crack of doom will impend, and we shall hold you up as a 'hermit nation,' and there are the provisions for boycotts in this league, and all sorts of horrible things will happen to you." And the President will order him to vote with them.

There is nothing to it. This is either a good thing or it is a bad thing. Those who think it is a good thing ought to be per-

fectly willing to vote for it as it stood, as 38 Democrats did; those who think it is a good thing ought not to put on any reservations, because it does not need them; those who think it is a bad thing ought, if they have sense enough to see that it is a bad thing, to have sense enough to know that a bad thing can not be made a good thing by a few reservations. Here is a great international trust to be organized, and we are a little leery about trusts; we think they are against public policy and against democracy, and we do not like to go in; but we will say, "Well, if you will let us in in a limited liability kind of way, so that we can claim that we are not really in the trust, and will put in some things to save our faces in case we are indicted for a criminal conspiracy, we will join."

It does not "listen good" to me, Mr. President. I believe that America, if it wants international leadership, if it wants to establish its ideal of morality and fair play and justice, if it is higher than that of other nations—and we think it is—will stand an infinitely better chance of accomplishing those objects by staying out of the intricacies and concealed and half-visible doubts and entanglements of this league. Standing clear, America can be of a thousand times more influence for justice and for international good will and for peace and good order upon the earth as the free, independent America, which we were founded to be and hitherto always have been, than we can as the internationalized and denationalized partner of this new internationalism.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the pending controversy over Fiume is very prominent just now, because of the publication of the correspondence between the President and the two principal members of the supreme council, of which we have just been informed. It presents a situation which seems to be fraught with tremendous possible consequences and affords a graphic illustration of the perils which I fear will beset the United States in the event it becomes a partner and associate in the proposed League of Nations.

The extent of the territory involved is trivial, but the consequences which may flow from its forcible adjustment or even from a peaceful solution seem to me to be very serious and far-reaching.

The insistence of the President upon the understanding which he approved during the closing days of the last year and which he now maintains must be observed, unless the two nations which are directly in interest shall otherwise agree, which is highly improbable, will in all likelihood encourage and stimulate the Jugo-Slavic nation to an insistence upon all that is involved in that agreement. It is but natural that, having the sanction of the greatest Nation in the world behind them, they should feel indisposed to yield anything, whereas without that sanction the difficulty might be adjusted. In the event the solution becomes impossible—and I fear that will be the situation—the result is obvious, and war may again make its appearance between two great European nations.

Italy has behind it the sanction of her treaty of 1915 with France and England. Jugo-Slavia has behind it the sanction of the Government of the United States, and, in the event of hostilities, the moral obligation now imposed upon the United States would certainly require its recognition of her cause. That means but one thing—our participation in another European war, or our refusal to sustain our present attitude by force. In the one instance we may be involved in a conflict which may be precipitated between ourselves and some of our recent allies; in the other we will be justly charged with a repudiation of a doctrine upon the strength of which one nation was encouraged to persist in its demands, and which has a consequent right to depend upon us for aid, should appeal be made to the sword.

On the other hand, any settlement resulting from the position the United States now occupies, whatever that settlement may be, will necessarily arouse in the disappointed nation a feeling of resentment toward the United States, national in its character, and which may, in the course of time, develop into serious controversy. All of which indicates the contingencies confronting us as a member of the league in conjunction with every dispute in which we may be called upon to participate and which our potent influence may determine.

It is the most obvious thing in the world, it is a matter of our daily experience, that the individual involved in a controversy seldom loses, whether by arbitration or by the judgment of a court, without feeling that injustice has been done him, and without inwardly resolving to take advantage of any opportunity which may be offered in the future for his satisfaction. That which the individual feels because of his controversy, the nations, which are collections of individuals only, entertain perhaps in much greater degree. I can not, therefore, but regard the incident as in some respects providential, should we give it

due heed, since it reveals with the utmost clearness the responsibilities which we are about to assume, not for one year or two years, which is a contingency, but for all time.

The very fact that the United States is the greatest Nation in the world and isolated from the other great powers will naturally make it the arbiter of arbiters in all disputes between European and Asiatic countries. We must assume the responsibility, therefore, of deciding those disputes or, at least, of shifting the equilibrium between the two sides in the one way or the other, and in every instance where we settle the dispute we create another enemy. Instead, therefore, of contributing to the harmony of nations, it would seem, if we are to take this incident as an illustration of what we shall encounter, that harmony will be obtained at the expense of American popularity and leadership. Such a price no nation, however powerful, can afford to pay.

There is another thought which has occurred to me, Mr. President, in connection with this controversy. However much we may attempt to safeguard the Monroe doctrine, either in the text of the treaty or by reservations, we can not both enter the league and also preserve the integrity of that policy. Our union in a great family of nations will prove entirely inconsistent in practice, although it may not in theory, with our reservation of that great policy which has shaped the destiny of the Western Hemisphere ever since its announcement and whose continual recognition is admittedly essential to the welfare and the future of the American Republic.

This contention can be illustrated by a situation on the Western Hemisphere which is analogous to that of Fiume. I refer to the dispute now and for some time existing between Peru and Chile over two provinces which, at the close of the war between those two countries, were taken over by Chile to be held for a certain number of years.

Chile contends that her right to those provinces is permanent; Peru contends that the terms of the treaty having been complied with, they should be restored to her, while Bolivia insists upon one of them, that she may have an outlet to the sea. Here are the conditions of a grave international controversy, first, between two nations claiming the same territory, and, second, between these and Bolivia, once the owner of one of the provinces, shut off from the sea, and entitled by all the principles of economic justice to access to the highways of the sea for her foreign trade.

When the league is established, this controversy must go to it for solution, if the nations parties to it belong to the league, or if it threatens the peace of nations, whether they belong to it or not.

Now, let us assume, Mr. President, that the league disposes of that controversy, after due consideration, in a manner unsatisfactory to the United States, albeit the decision may have been assented to by our representative. It certainly will not be satisfactory to the nation or two of the three nations whose interests are adverse to the ultimate decision. But the league, having made the decision, must enforce it whether satisfactory or not. The sympathies of the United States—indeed, the interests of the United States—may be with the disappointed party; and yet, the Monroe doctrine to the contrary notwithstanding, our membership in the league would preclude us from doing otherwise than recognizing the decision and contributing the forces of our Army, our Navy, and our Treasury to its establishment.

We can, if my illustration be reliable, decline to do anything; but that would involve a condition not compatible with the integrity of American agreements. We might protest, but our protest might be unavailing. If we should resort to the principle of the Monroe doctrine to vindicate our attitude, we would repudiate the covenant of the league. If we acquiesced in the decision of the league, although inimical to ourselves, we would abandon the Monroe doctrine pro tanto. Sooner or later that controversy will become acute, league or no league. It is even now of serious proportions. It would seem to me, therefore, that the Fiume incident offers a striking example of the dangers involved in the League of Nations and a solemn warning against our entry into it.

I may be prejudiced regarding this subject. It may be that the situation is otherwise than as it appears to me; yet so serious is it that the President of the United States justifies his insistence upon its adjustments in harmony with his own view that he contemplates a withdrawal of the treaty, which means its abrogation, unless his demand be complied with. I can not therefore overemphasize its importance or draw too somber a lesson from the consequences which it forebodes once we enter upon this new and untried experiment and take what Lord Grey happily calls this "plunge into the unknown."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	Knox	Sheppard
Ball	Gronna	Lenroot	Shields
Borah	Hale	Lodge	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Chamberlain	Harrison	Myers	Spencer
Colt	Henderson	New	Sterling
Culberson	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Trammell
Edkins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Underwood
Fernald	Kellogg	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
France	Kenyon	Pittman	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Poindexter	
Gay	King	Pomerene	
Gerry	Kirby	Ransdell	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the construction given to-day by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] of the substitute which he has offered. I read it to show that his own statement construes it as being an amendment to the treaty. I congratulate him that he has gotten away from interpretative reservations:

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean to say that no nation, the United States nor any other nation, shall be compelled to submit to the council a domestic question, nor to permit the council to decide what is a domestic question.

There we have his declaration that this substitute is to prevent the council from deciding what is a domestic question. Here is the treaty. It declares that the members agree either to arbitrate every dispute or to submit them to the council. Now, I will read the provision of the covenant on disputes when one of the parties claims it is a domestic question:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendations as to its settlement.

So that the league covenant expressly provides that the council shall pass upon the question as to whether a particular dispute falls within the class of a domestic dispute. The substitute of the Senator from Nebraska, according to his own interpretation, takes away from the league the right to decide what is and what is not a domestic question, and it takes it away not only so far as the United States is concerned, but as to all nations members of the league. It changes the substance of the league covenant.

I am glad that the Senator realizes that there are provisions in the league covenant that can not be handled by interpretation and that require change. I have insisted for some time that there were provisions in the league covenant to which we should not submit and that by reservations we should take ourselves out from under objectionable provisions. That can be done, leaving other nations to stay under the terms of the provisions if they wish.

Only a few days ago Switzerland went into the league, reserving to herself freedom from the obligation of article 10 to put her troops behind the countries, members of the league, that might be involved in war, and also reserving to herself the right to refuse to permit armies to pass through Switzerland, making two distinct reservations taking Switzerland out from under two distinct provisions of the league covenant. So we can take our country out from under provisions if we wish.

I object to this amendment, not because I object to freeing the United States from the objectionable provision as to domestic questions, but because, if we amend the treaty, it must go back to the conference in Paris. It must go back to the countries that have already ratified it. It is a change of the substance of the covenant; not merely a refusal, so far as we are concerned, to submit to the particular provision.

This amendment by the Senator from Nebraska would greatly delay if it did not defeat acceptance by the other countries of ratification by the United States. It is more objectionable than the reservation reported by the committee. I am opposed to it because I favor ratification with reservations and not with amendments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would like to have a vote upon this matter this afternoon. I have no particular desire to delay the matter unduly, but I wonder if the Senator would be willing to have unanimous consent given to vote upon it on Monday not later than 1 o'clock, and permit the vote to go over until that time?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator means on the reservation and the two pending amendments?

Mr. BORAH. I mean on reservation 4 and all amendments which may be offered to it.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; there are two pending.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether that request would contemplate that there should be no debate beyond 1 o'clock if substitutes should be offered for the pending reservation?

Mr. BORAH. Of course I contemplate that, but I would be perfectly willing to modify it to a later hour if the Senator thinks he would want some little time. My opinion is that this matter can be voted on immediately upon coming in; and then if we said "not later than 1 o'clock" the Senator would have time to present his amendment.

Mr. KING. I shall take only a moment or two to submit the substitute which I shall offer for the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts; but there may be a number of other reservations offered in the form of substitutes or there may be amendments offered to the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is now late on Saturday afternoon. I should be glad to make such an arrangement; but if Senators on the other side are going to insist that more time than two hours shall be given to discuss a subject that we have been discussing now for 48 hours, of course I shall feel bound to hold the Senate in session as late as I can.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would suggest that the Senator make his request for 2 o'clock. A number of Senators are out of the city, and if the matter is not to be voted on to-day it is just as well to let it go to that hour, so as to accommodate them until their return. If the Senator will make it 2 o'clock, that will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to make it 2 o'clock, but if that is to be done I shall have to ask that when the Senate adjourns it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday. The Military Academy appropriation bill ought to be taken up and disposed of promptly, and I should like to have an hour extra for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. If it is understood that the hour extra will be used for that purpose, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] if he thinks the bill can be disposed of in that time?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it can be disposed of in an hour.

Mr. BORAH. It was not the limit of time upon the Military Academy bill to which I referred, but it is the understanding that that bill is to be taken up the first thing?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; immediately upon the convening of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I will ask the Senator if he will prefer a request for unanimous consent to vote on this reservation at 2 o'clock?

Mr. LODGE. I will. I must ask now for a brief executive session. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without further debate the vote be taken on reservation No. 4 and all pending amendments at 2 o'clock on Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will reduce the proposed agreement to writing and state it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Monday, March 1, 1920, the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon reported reservation No. 4 to the treaty of peace with Germany, any amendment that may then be pending or that may be offered thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

EXECUTIVE SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business with closed doors.

The motion was agreed to, and the doors were closed. After 10 minutes the doors were reopened and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Bainbridge Colby, of New York, to be Secretary of State, vice Robert Lansing, resigned.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

George W. P. Hunt, of Arizona, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Siam.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Estelle V. Collier, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 48, with headquarters at Salt Lake City, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John D. Lynn, of Rochester, N. Y., to be United States marshal, western district of New York. (A reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer):

Henry Bowers Campbell, of New York, vice J. A. Daniels, resigned.

The following-named officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid):

Robert Francis Anthony Studds, of the District of Columbia, vice W. T. Combs, promoted.

INTERNATIONAL TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONFERENCE.

The following-named persons as representatives of the Government of the United States to participate in an international conference to be held in Washington to consider all international aspects of communication by telegraph, telephone, cable, wireless telephone, and wireless telegraphy, and to make recommendations with a view to providing the entire world with adequate facilities for international communication on a fair and equitable basis:

Albert S. Burleson, of Texas, Postmaster General of the United States.

Rear Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, retired.

Walter S. Rogers, of LaGrange, Ill.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Noel Davis to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 25th day of September, 1919.

Lieut. Carl H. Jones to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 20th day of October, 1919.

Medical Inspector Edgar Thompson to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Surg. Aulse H. Robnett to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October, 1919.

Surg. Spencer L. Higgins to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 23d day of October, 1919.

Surg. Harry R. Hermes to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Lieut. Philip B. Becker, United States Naval Reserve Corps, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1919.

Paymaster Frederick B. Colby to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 12th day of October, 1919.

Paymaster Edward E. Goodhue to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 30th day of October, 1919.

Naval Constructor Ernest F. Eggert to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 18th day of November, 1919.

Naval Constructor Andrew W. Carmichael to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 16th day of November, 1919.

The following-named officers to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 18th day of November, 1919:

Thomas B. Richey and

Henry E. Rossell.

Capt. William R. Shoemaker to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

John T. Tompkins,
Hutch I. Cone,
Ernest L. Bennett, and
Franklin D. Karns.

Commander John V. Klemann to be captain in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1919.

Commander William H. Standley to be a captain in the Navy from the 22d day of December, 1919.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Victor S. Houston,
Merlyn G. Cook,
Lewis Coxe,
William H. Allen,
Jesse B. Gay,
John V. Babcock,
James O. Richardson,
Lewis B. Porterfield,
David A. Weaver,
Frederick R. Naile,
John P. Jackson,
Theodore A. Kittinger,
Joseph L. Hileman,
William W. Galbraith,
Rufus F. Zogbaum, jr.,
George J. Meyers,
Adolphus Staton,
Neil E. Nichols, and
Charles W. Early.

Lieut. Commander John F. Green to be a commander in the Navy from the 20th day of July, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Edward C. S. Parker to be a commander in the Navy from the 17th day of August, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Frank B. Freyer to be a commander in the Navy from the 25th day of September, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Carlos Bean to be a commander in the Navy from the 20th day of October, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Roscoe C. Davis to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of October, 1919.

Lieut. Commander John A. Monroe to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Randall Jacobs,
Ralph C. Needham,
John H. Hoover,
George W. Kenyon,
William S. Farber,
Baxter H. Bruce,
Elmer W. Tod,
Robert T. S. Lowell,
Irving H. Mayfield,
Raymond F. Frelsen,
John M. Schelling,
Harry J. Abbett,
Thomas A. Symington,
William F. Amsden, and
Charles C. Windsor.

Lieut. Alexander M. Charlton to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1919.

Lieut. Kirkwood H. Donavin to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 22d day of December, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jefferson D. Smith to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Lloyd R. Gray,
Henry M. Briggs,
Walter E. Doyle,
Paul Hendren,
Thomas G. Berrien, and
Stuart E. Bray.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Valentine Wood to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Ensign John J. Mahoney to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1919:

Paul W. Rutledge, and
Knefler McGinnis.

Medical Inspector Granville L. Angeny to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 28th day of December, 1919.

Surg. Henry A. May to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Surg. Norman T. McLean to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 5th day of October, 1919.

Assistant Surgeon for Temporary Service Wendell P. Blake to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 15th day of January, 1920.

Passed Asst. Surg. James B. Moloney, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of January, 1920.

Professor of Mathematics William S. Eichelberger to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 18th day of September, 1918.

Naval Constructor James L. Ackerson to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 21st day of January, 1920.

Boatswain David F. Mead to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 19th day of February, 1918.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 11th day of January, 1919:

John H. MacDonald and
Nathan E. Cook.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1919:

Charles W. Wagner,
William W. Holton,
Max Bayer,
George F. Veth,
Charles J. Naprstek, and
William S. Evans.

Lieut. Commander William D. Puleston to be a commander in the Navy from the 19th day of November, 1919.

Lieut. Commander Earl P. Finney to be a commander in the Navy from the 22d day of October, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

George W. Simpson and
Elmo H. Williams.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William L. Jones to be postmaster at Parrish, Ala., in place of R. G. Waldrop, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

ARKANSAS.

Azro C. Brooks to be postmaster at Harrison, Ark., in place of J. B. Holder, resigned.

FLORIDA.

Sallie Grace to be postmaster at Graceville, Fla., in place of Walter Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

MARYLAND.

Donald E. Clark to be postmaster at Silver Springs, Md., in place of C. A. Barnes, deceased.

MICHIGAN.

Estella R. Newcomb to be postmaster at Le Roy, Mich., in place of G. W. Parker, resigned.

Edward F. Eversole to be postmaster at Redford, Mich., in place of C. A. Lahser, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Ward W. Miller to be postmaster at Bayard, Nebr., in place of G. C. Fox, resigned.

Leah P. Rice to be postmaster at Harrison, Nebr., in place of Alexander Lowry, resigned.

Clifford R. Young to be postmaster at Marquette, Nebr., in place of L. L. Colby, declined.

Harry M. Townsend to be postmaster at Minatare, Nebr., in place of E. O. Harshman, resigned.

Etta H. Bartlett to be postmaster at Potter, Nebr., in place of Fred Nelson, deceased.

George E. Barto to be postmaster at Wakefield, Nebr., in place of Byron Busby, resigned.

George E. Gilpin to be postmaster at Wilsonville, Nebr., in place of F. R. Parker, resigned.

NEW JERSEY.

Gunnar A. Spangberg to be postmaster at New Egypt, N. J., in place of W. T. Nash, resigned.

William G. Cowgill to be postmaster at Paulsboro, N. J., in place of W. J. Cowgill, to correct name.

NEW YORK.

Leon Pralatowski to be postmaster at Cold Spring, N. Y., in place of Otis Montrose, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John E. Nelson to be postmaster at Litchville, N. Dak., in place of J. B. Christensen, resigned.

Henry Branderhorst to be postmaster at Ray, N. Dak., in place of N. W. Moelbring, resigned.

Michael Coyne to be postmaster at Starkweather, N. Dak., in place of P. F. Meharry, resigned.

Andrew M. Hewson to be postmaster at Wimbledon, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Swartwout, resigned.

OHIO.

John E. Futhey to be postmaster at Adena, Ohio, in place of W. P. Moore, resigned.

Henry W. Streb to be postmaster at Dover, Ohio, in place of H. W. Streb. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1919.

Fred D. Hart to be postmaster at Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of G. L. Higby, resigned.

Ethel D. Young to be postmaster at Linden Heights, Ohio, in place of O. M. Brobst, resigned.

Robert E. Friel to be postmaster at Lore City, Ohio, in place of C. H. Robertson, resigned.

Edwin H. Hayman to be postmaster at Murray, Ohio, in place of W. M. Polling, declined.

Allan R. Trumbull to be postmaster at Swanton, Ohio, in place of A. A. Lathrop, deceased.

Asher O. Earley to be postmaster at Woodsfield, Ohio, in place of Thurman Springs, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

Frank S. Neptune to be postmaster at Bartlesville, Okla., in place of Frederick McDaniel, removed.

Harry T. Wolfe to be postmaster at Bristow, Okla., in place of H. F. Wolfe, to correct name.

Blanche R. Harrison to be postmaster at Byars, Okla., in place of E. R. Harrison, resigned.

Paul H. Shelton to be postmaster at Covington, Okla., in place of O. J. Conner, resigned. Office became presidential October 1, 1918.

Alva G. Sweezy to be postmaster at Quapaw, Okla., in place of G. U. Jennison, removed. Office became presidential January 1, 1918.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Edward C. Eichholtz to be postmaster at Drexel Hill, Pa., in place of M. S. Kerney, resigned.

Rollo E. Shirey to be postmaster at Foxburg, Pa., in place of J. M. Keesey, removed.

Stanley M. Williams to be postmaster at Hop Bottom, Pa., in place of J. W. Bisbee, resigned.

Laura M. Peacock to be postmaster at Houston, Pa., in place of T. A. Riggle, resigned.

Robert F. Turner to be postmaster at Lincoln University, Pa., in place of J. H. Turner, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

William R. Williams to be postmaster at Bells, Tenn., in place of G. W. Bell, resigned.

TEXAS.

Arthur E. Davis to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Tex., in place of Dattie McFall, resigned.

Edgar Lewis to be postmaster at Mesquite, Tex., in place of E. P. Shands, resigned.

Duane B. Scarborough to be postmaster at Oakwood, Tex., in place of Claude Wiley, resigned.

Edmond L. Wheeler to be postmaster at Paducah, Tex., in place of W. B. Stradley, resigned.

UTAH.

Thomas C. Smiley to be postmaster at Helper, Utah, in place of L. E. Young, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Stella I. Wells to be postmaster at Bethany, W. Va., in place of W. E. Reeves, removed.

WASHINGTON.

Mabel G. Lamm to be postmaster at Burlington, Wash., in place of Thomas McIntyre, deceased.

Garrett R. Patterson to be postmaster at Malden, Wash., in place of G. R. Patterson, resigned.

Kathryn Fenton to be postmaster at Orting, Wash., in place of James O'Farrell, jr., removed.

Ethel M. DeLong to be postmaster at St. John, Wash., in place of J. C. Crane, resigned.

Rose M. Illy to be postmaster at Uniontown, Wash., in place of M. A. Illy, resigned.

Julia Estes to be postmaster at White Salmon, Wash., in place of G. G. Crow, resigned.

WYOMING.

William B. Cooper to be postmaster at Green River, Wyo., in place of W. A. Johnson, resigned.

Rachael G. Chappell to be postmaster at Superior, Wyo., in place of F. S. Heltz, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

John Barton Payne to be Secretary of the Interior.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Wayne Johnson to be Solicitor of Internal Revenue.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Col. Charles L. Potter to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

Lieut. Col. Herbert Deakyne to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Lieut. Col. Harry Burgess to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

William A. Kelly to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Nevada.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles D. McAvoy to be United States attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Ernest Werner Eickleberg to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

Earl Oscar Heaton to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

Louis Morris Zeskind to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Henry Caperton Warwick to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Jacob Stanley Rosenthal to be an aid in Coast and Geodetic Survey.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Siegfried Kuraner, Fort Leavenworth.

Frederick D. Lamb, Manhattan.

Anna M. Bryan, Mullinville.

Robert J. Rowe, Ogden.

MINNESOTA.

Frederic E. Hamlin, Chaska.

Mary I. McGuire, Norwood.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 27), 1920.

POSTMASTER.

MICHIGAN.

Wallace Grace to be postmaster at Redford, Mich.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnipresent God, our Father, ever ready to uphold, sustain, and guide Thy children. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;

Even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me.

Help us to conserve our intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts against the day of disaster and sorrows, when the earth seems to be slipping from beneath our feet and all that we hold dear seems lost.